

## Getting hyperlinks right

Published: January 14, 2026, 4:54 pm

---

As the number of entries in the glossary has risen some feedback was made that the hyperlinks to it were a distraction, being too bright and too bold.

So, they are now in a deeper red than standard hyperlinks and are not in bold. Italics have also been removed.

They now might look like this:

As [research I did with others at Sheffield and Queen Mary, London](#) showed, the modern [corporation](#) often pays out more by way of dividends than it earns by way of profits. It succeeds in doing so by ever-increasing its borrowing and by undertaking arbitrage between various [financial reporting standards](#). In particular, they are prone to abusing the differing rules of UK [generally accepted accounting principles](#) and [International Financial Reporting Standards in group accounts](#) meaning they recognise much more profit in the [group parent accounts](#) than they do as a result of actual trading by the [group](#) as a whole and it is this [parent company](#) pot that they use to pay dividends.

Is that better? Adding the glossary appears to be important but making it a distraction is not the aim. If you have an opinion might you let me know?

It was to seek opinion on this that the idea of adding polling to the site occurred to me (although once I had realised it was possible I saw the potential for other purposes) so can I do a poll on this?

[poll id="6"]

Comments are also welcome: it is important that I get this right for as many readers as possible.

And on another blogging-related issue, the inclusion of polls boosted traffic considerably yesterday. 9,000 reads on a Saturday is unusual but was recorded yesterday.