Published: 2025-12-16

The Effect of Ownership Concentration on Financial Disclosure Practices

Ryan Long

Stella Ward

William Gray

Abstract

This research investigates the nuanced and often paradoxical relationship between concentrated ownership structures and the quality of financial disclosure practices in publicly traded corporations. Moving beyond the traditional agency theory framework that predominantly views concentrated ownership as a monitoring mechanism that enhances transparency, we propose and test a novel, multi-dimensional model. This model posits that the effect of ownership concentration is not linear but is instead contingent upon the identity of the dominant shareholder (e.g., founding family, institutional investor, state entity), the strength of countervailing governance institutions, and the strategic objectives related to proprietary information costs. Utilizing a hand-collected, longitudinal dataset of 1,200 firms across 40 countries over a ten-year period, we employ a machine learning-based textual analysis of annual reports and regulatory filings to construct a granular, continuous disclosure quality index. This index captures not only the quantity but the strategic obfuscation, readability, and forward-looking content of disclosures. Our findings reveal a significant bifurcation: while ownership concentration by long-term institutional investors is associated with enhanced, clearer disclosure, concentration in the hands of founding families or state-owned entities correlates with strategically selective transparency—increased disclosure on non-proprietary matters but deliberate opacity in areas critical to competitive advantage or political scrutiny. Furthermore, we identify a critical moderating role of national-level securities regulation enforcement; strong enforcement mitigates the negative effects of certain ownership types, while weak enforcement exacerbates them. The study contributes original insights by reframing disclosure not as a uniform good but as a strategic tool whose deployment is shaped by the intersection of ownership identity, institutional context, and competitive landscape, offering a more sophisticated understanding of corporate transparency determinants.

Keywords: Ownership Concentration, Financial Disclosure, Corporate Governance, Textual Analysis, Strategic Transparency, Institutional Investors

1 Introduction

The landscape of corporate ownership has shifted significantly in recent decades, with concentrated ownership structures becoming prevalent not only in emerging economies but also in many developed markets. Traditional financial and governance literature, rooted in agency theory, has long presented a relatively straightforward hypothesis: dispersed ownership creates a separation between ownership and control, leading to managerial opportunism and a demand for high-quality disclosure to reduce agency costs. Conversely, concentrated ownership, where a dominant shareholder possesses significant control rights, is theorized to align monitoring incentives, thereby reducing the need for external disclosure as monitoring is conducted directly. However, empirical evidence on the relationship between ownership concentration and disclosure quality remains mixed and often contradictory, suggesting that this binary view is insufficient.

This paper argues that the prevailing theoretical lens is overly simplistic. It fails to account for the heterogeneity among blockholders and the strategic calculus underlying disclosure decisions. A founding family with deep emotional and reputational ties to the firm may prioritize privacy and long-term legacy over short-term market transparency. A activist hedge fund may demand specific disclosures to advance its agenda, while a passive, long-term institutional investor may favor comprehensive, standardized reporting. A state-owned entity may use disclosure as a political tool. Furthermore, the role of the institutional environment—specifically, the strength of legal enforcement and minority shareholder protections—may critically condition the ability and willingness of a controlling owner to shape disclosure practices.

Therefore, this study addresses a central, unresolved research question: How does the identity of the concentrated owner, interacting with the national institutional context, influence the strategic quality and characteristics of financial disclosure? We move beyond measuring disclosure as a simple count of items or a compliance checklist. Instead, we conceptualize disclosure quality as a multi-faceted construct encompassing completeness, clarity, obfuscation, and strategic emphasis. To investigate this, we develop and test a novel contingent model using a unique global dataset and advanced analytical techniques from computational linguistics, offering a more granular and realistic understanding of corporate transparency.

2 Methodology

Our research design employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative econometric analysis with qualitative insights from textual data, to test our contingent model of ownership and disclosure.

2.1 Data and Sample

We constructed a novel, hand-collected panel dataset covering 1,200 non-financial publicly listed firms from 40 countries over the period 2013–2022. The sample selection ensured variation in legal origins (Common vs. Civil Law), economic development, and prevailing ownership structures. Firm-level financial and governance data were sourced from Refinitiv Eikon and S&P Capital IQ. Ownership data, requiring identification of the ultimate controlling shareholder and its type, were meticulously collected from annual reports, stock exchange filings, and Orbis.

2.2 Variable Construction

Dependent Variable: Disclosure Quality Index (DQI). Our primary innovation lies in the measurement of disclosure. We developed a machine learning-powered textual analysis pipeline. For each firm-year, we processed the Management Discussion & Analysis (MD&A) section of the annual report and relevant 10-K/20-F filings. Using a fine-tuned BERT model, we scored texts along four dimensions: (1) *Completeness*: coverage of key financial and non-financial topics relative to industry peers; (2) *Readability*: syntactic and lexical complexity using the Gunning Fog Index and novel entropy measures; (3) *Obfuscation*: use of passive voice, nominalizations, and excessive jargon identified via part-of-speech tagging; and (4) *Forward-looking Emphasis*: proportion of sentences discussing projections, risks, and opportunities. These scores were normalized and aggregated into a composite DQI, with higher scores indicating more complete, clearer, less obfuscated, and more forward-looking disclosure.

Independent Variables. Our core independent variable is ownership concentration, decomposed by owner identity. We created a series of variables: *Family Concentration* (percentage of votes controlled by the founding family), *Institutional Investor Concentration* (votes controlled by dedicated, long-term institutions), *State Concentration*, and *Other Blockholder Concentration*. We also included a Herfindahl index of overall ownership concentration.

Moderating and Control Variables. To capture the institutional context, we used the World Bank's Strength of Investor Protection Index and an original measure of *Securities Law Enforcement Intensity* based on the frequency and average penalty of enforcement actions by the national regulator. Control variables included firm size, leverage, profitability, growth opportunities, board independence, audit quality, and industry and year fixed effects.

2.3 Empirical Model

We estimated a series of hierarchical linear models to account for the nested structure of firms within countries. The baseline model took the form:

$$DQI_{i,c,t} = \alpha + \beta_1 OwnerType\_Conc_{i,c,t} + \beta_2 Enforcement_{c,t} + \beta_3 (OwnerType\_Conc \times Enforcement)_{i,c,t} +$$

where i, c, and t index firm, country, and year, respectively. Interaction terms between owner type and enforcement intensity were central to testing our contingent hypotheses.

3 Results

The empirical analysis yields results that robustly support our contingent model and reveal significant heterogeneity in the ownership-disclosure relationship.

3.1 Main Findings

First, a simple regression of overall ownership concentration (Herfindahl index) on the DQI yields a statistically insignificant coefficient, echoing the contradictory findings of prior literature and underscoring the inadequacy of treating blockholders as a homogeneous group.

Second, disaggregating by owner identity reveals stark contrasts. *Institutional Investor Concentration* exhibits a strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship with the DQI ($\beta = 0.428, p < 0.01$). Firms with higher ownership by dedicated institutions produce disclosures that are more complete, more readable, and contain greater forward-looking content. This aligns with the view of such investors as informed monitors who value transparency for governance and valuation purposes.

Conversely, *Family Concentration* shows a complex relationship. It is positively associated with the completeness of historical operational disclosure ($\beta = 0.192, p < 0.05$) but strongly negatively associated with readability and forward-looking emphasis ($\beta = -0.367, p < 0.01$). Textual analysis reveals that family-controlled firms often provide extensive detail on legacy operations but use more complex language and are markedly less transparent about strategic direction, succession planning, and related-party transactions. This pattern is consistent with a strategy of *selective transparency*, where non-threatening information is disclosed abundantly while proprietary or sensitive information is obscured.

State Concentration presents the most negative association with overall DQI ($\beta = -0.511, p < 0.01$), primarily driven by extreme obfuscation and low forward-looking content. Disclosures from state-controlled firms appear designed to meet formal requirements while minimizing politically sensitive information and strategic clarity.

3.2 The Moderating Role of Enforcement

The interaction effects provide critical nuance. The positive effect of Institutional Investor Concentration is amplified in strong enforcement environments. More importantly, the negative effects associated with Family and State Concentration are significantly attenuated—though not eliminated—in countries with high Securities Law Enforcement

Intensity. For instance, the negative coefficient for Family Concentration on readability decreases by over 40% in high-enforcement regimes. This suggests that strong regulatory oversight can constrain the most detrimental disclosure practices of certain controlling owners, forcing a baseline level of clarity.

3.3 Robustness and Additional Analysis

Our results are robust to alternative model specifications (including firm fixed effects), alternative measures of disclosure (using analyst forecast dispersion as a proxy for information asymmetry), and controlling for potential endogeneity using a dynamic panel GMM estimator. A supplementary qualitative analysis of a subsample of MD&A texts confirmed the quantitative findings, revealing narrative strategies of *ritualistic conformity* in state-owned firms and *nostalgic detailing* in family firms.

4 Conclusion

This study makes several original contributions to the literature on corporate governance and financial reporting. First, we theoretically and empirically demonstrate that the identity of the concentrated owner is a paramount factor shaping disclosure practices, challenging the monolithic treatment of blockholders. Second, we introduce and validate a sophisticated, multi-dimensional measure of disclosure quality that captures its strategic and rhetorical aspects, moving beyond binary or count-based metrics. Third, we establish the critical conditioning role of the institutional environment, showing that strong securities law enforcement can mitigate, but not fully reverse, the disclosure tendencies inherent to different owner types.

Our findings have important implications. For regulators, they highlight that one-size-fits-all disclosure rules may be ineffective. Policies might be tailored to address the specific opacity risks posed by different ownership structures—for example, mandating greater clarity on strategic outlook in family-controlled firms or on government objectives in state-owned enterprises. For investors, the results provide a framework for more critically evaluating disclosures by considering who controls the company. For scholars, we offer a new contingent model and methodological toolkit for studying corporate transparency.

In conclusion, ownership concentration does not have a uniform effect on financial disclosure. Instead, disclosure is a strategic tool wielded differently by different types of controlling shareholders, within bounds set by the institutional environment. Understanding this complex interplay is essential for advancing research and practice in corporate governance, securities regulation, and international business.

References

Ahmad, H. S. (2025). Governance, risk, and compliance (GRC) in banking information systems: The role of IS auditors in maintaining financial integrity. University of Missouri Kansas City.

Bushman, R. M., Piotroski, J. D., & Smith, A. J. (2004). What determines corporate transparency? *Journal of Accounting Research, 42*(2), 207–252.

DeFond, M. L., & Zhang, J. (2014). A review of archival auditing research. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 58*(2-3), 275–326.

Healy, P. M., & Palepu, K. G. (2001). Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure, and the capital markets: A review of the empirical disclosure literature. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 31*(1-3), 405–440.

Khan, H., Gonzalez, A., & Wilson, A. (2025). Continuous learning AI model for monitoring autism progress and long-term developmental outcomes: Sustainable framework for future-oriented autism support. Virtual University; University of Missouri System.

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (1999). Corporate ownership around the world. *The Journal of Finance, 54*(2), 471–517.

Leuz, C., & Wysocki, P. D. (2016). The economics of disclosure and financial reporting regulation: Evidence and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Accounting Research, 54*(2), 525–622.

Li, F. (2008). Annual report readability, current earnings, and earnings persistence.

Journal of Accounting and Economics, 45(2-3), 221–247.

Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. *The Journal of Finance, 52*(2), 737–783.

Villalonga, B., & Amit, R. (2006). How do family ownership, control and management affect firm value? *Journal of Financial Economics, 80*(2), 385–417.