ISSN 1392-1142
ORGANIZACIJŲ VADYBA:
SISTEMINIAI TYRIMAI: 2010.56

Kevin A. DIEHL

Scandinavia v. the Baltic: Whose Trend in Financial Statements Reporting of Property, Plant, and Equipment Will Prevail, and What Are the Strategic Consequences?

Managers must choose cost or fair value to measure property, plant, and equipment. This research reports on the trend. Data emerge from policy disclosures in the 2009 annual reports. In percentage and number of industries, fair value is more prevalent in the Baltic than in Scandinavia.

Keywords: International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS), International Accounting Standard (IAS) 16, property, plant, equipment.

Vadovams tenka rinktis, kaip vertinti įmonių ilgalaikį materialųjį turtą: ar atskleisti finansinėse ataskaitose tokio turto savikainą, ar tikrąją vertę. Šis straipsnis išryškina tendencijas, autorius analizuoja duomenis atskleistus 2009 metų metinėse ataskaitose. Palyginus ataskaitas išryškėja, kad Baltijos šalyse vyrauja tendencija atskleisti tikąją ilgalaikio turto vertę, o Skandinavijoje – turto savikainą.

Raktiniai žodžiai: tarptautiniai finansinės atskaitomybės standartai (TFAS), tarptautinis 16-tasis verslo apskaitos standartas (TVAS), ilgalaikis materialusis turtas.

Introduction

Objective. Because no extant research discusses the current trend in the utilization of cost or fair value for property, plant, and equipment in the Baltic or Scandinavian countries, this research seeks to determine that trend in reporting. Under the relevant part of the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS), International Accounting Standard (IAS) 16, management teams must select between cost and fair value in valuing property, plant, and equipment on the financial statements. Baltic managers of publicly traded companies must make this decision on an annual basis, so providing them information on this choice is important. This choice can have effects on whether managers maintain their jobs as fair value can result in higher stock prices and lower interest rates. Scandinavia has more years of experience with this public reporting process but still has many economic issues in common with the Baltic countries. Thus, this region provides an excellent basis for comparison of results.

Tasks. To gather this data, this research involves my review of 2009 annual reports'

Kevin A. DIEHL - JD, Certified Public Accountant, assistant professor at Western Illinois University, USA. Address: 3561 60th Street Moline, IL 61265. Tel.: (309) 762-3999. E-mail: KA-Diehl@wiu.edu

accounting policy discussions for all the companies traded as part of the renowned stock exchange indices in the region to determine which choice predominates. Each company's internet site must be accessed. There, the investors' relations area provides the link to the 2009 annual report. In the annual report, the accounting policy discussions are located after the financial statements. These footnote discussions disclose whether the particular company utilizes cost or fair value for measuring property, plant, and equipment. To verify whether the disclosed method is actually utilized, the footnote on property, plant, and equipment must also be reviewed. Then, to derive the percentage of companies utilizing fair value, division is done as the companies that utilize fair value within the particular index are the numerator number over all the companies in that particular index as the denominator number. This data then can inform Baltic company managers of what the trend is for companies within their region. At the same time, the research reviews what managers of Scandinavian companies are choosing. Thus, the identical division is done here to determine percentages. These percentages are then compared to the results for the Baltic indices. As Scandinavian managers face market conditions similar to Baltic managers (not to mention common histories as well), this comparison provides useful insight. Because financial industry companies are already involved significantly with fair value in their operations, companies in this industry are more likely to utilize fair value for property, plant, and equipment. During the evaluation of the annual reports, the industry of the company is determined in showing which industries have companies that utilize fair value.

Targets. Accounting policy disclosures within the annual reports of companies reported on the OMX Baltic First, OMX Tallinn First, OMX Riga First, and OMX Vilnius First are the targets for the first task. Accounting policy disclosures within the annual reports of companies reported on the OMX Nordic 40, OBX Oslo 25, OMX Stockholm 30, OMX Helsinki 25, OMX Copenhagen 20, and OMX Iceland 6 are the targets for the second task as means of comparison.

Research methods. The methods follow somewhat from R. Legenzova (2007). This work involves synthesizing scientific literature, evaluating annual reports, comparing results, and disclosing the findings here. The previous discussion of the tasks provides more detail on the implementation of the research method. The previous discussion of the targets establishes the samples for these research methods.

Research results. The Baltic seems to have embraced relevance as 24.32 percent of the OMX Baltic First utilizing fair value for property, plant, and equipment. However, Scandinavia seems to chosen reliability with 2.50 percent of the OMX Nordic 40 utilizing fair value for property, plant, and equipment.

For the Baltic then, virtually every industry has some representation as choosing fair value. For Scandinavia, only the financial industry seems to have chosen fair value.

The importance of these findings is now ascertainable. IAS 8 establishes that managers can revise their valuation choice on an annual basis. Thus, this trend toward fair value being more prevalent in the Baltic than in Scandinavia could encourage Baltic managers who have selected cost to reconsider that choice. If Baltic managers in non-financial industries

never considered utilizing fair value because of that fact, they now have to review the necessity of their initial policy choice. Fair value seems to be acceptable to any industry.

However, if Scandinavian managers more years of experience in dealing with public reporting stand for anything, then it could mean that, in the short term, Baltic companies should follow the higher trend toward fair value in their region than in Scandinavia to have financial statements comparable with their industry competitors. In the longer term, Scandinavia's results could provide cautionary warnings that valuing property, plant, and equipment at fair value is potentially more costly than it is beneficial.

Background

In 2002, the EU adopted IFRS to be effective for all EU publicly traded companies as of the 2005 financial reporting year (Armstrong, et al., 2010). The objective of IFRS is to establish one worldwide standard for financial reporting, which would lower investors' costs in comparing financial statements between any two countries (Ball, 2006). In the process then, companies could realize lower costs of capital and make the global securities markets more efficient (Ball, 2006).

IFRS has been value relevant in each market tested so far (Cairns, et al., 2009). This fact means that its adoption has improved the quality of the reported accounting numbers.

In fulfilling this objective, IFRS also seeks to make financial statements more relevant by emphasizing fair value reporting (Ball, 2006). Traditional accounting in many countries favored reliability. By requiring historical costs rather than fair value in reporting many assets, this traditional accounting sought verifiability at least in some part to limit the potential exposure to liability. To satisfy this relevance, companies must now turn more toward fair value in reporting their assets (Ball, 2006).

Relevance seeks to make the balance sheet more important than the income statement (Ball, 2006). IFRS does place some of the changes in fair value within the income statement with decreases lowering net income and increases elevating net income only to the extent decreases previously occurred (IAS 40). Financial institutions favor this turn of events as they can determine how much collateral is available better with those fair values as compared to previous statements with historical costs (Ball, 2006). However, investors could have issues with placing some fair value changes within the income statement because it could decrease the quality of earnings.

In establishing this relevance, IFRS requires fair value reporting in some areas but makes it elective in others (IAS 16). Because IFRS seeks to provide one global standard, the emphasis seems to be on comparability to at least the same extent as it is on relevance. That quest is apparent in the elimination of LIFO inventory reporting under IFRS (Ball, 2006).

Despite this apparent inconsistency within IFRS, management must be involved with two important accounting decisions. The two areas where fair value treatment is elective are in IAS 40 and IAS 16. IAS 40 gives management the choice of cost or fair value in reporting assets classified as investment properties in years after their acquisition. IAS 16 provides the identical choice except with regard to all

property, plant, and equipment not within that previous category. This grouping of property, plant, and equipment involves tangible assets with lives beyond one year.

Managers should care significantly about this choice because it can influence the perception of how well they have done their jobs and the extent to which they receive bonuses. Choosing fair value provides more usable numbers to the market (Ball, 2006). Utilizing fair value shows investors and creditors how valuable the core assets in producing revenues are in the current market. Cost refers to numbers sometimes more than one century old in the area of what the cost of buildings and land were at the time of starting the business. Property, plant, and equipment represent the essence of what the business is as they are the assets utilized to produce revenues and ultimately profits. Thus, no one can blame investors and creditors for wanting to know whether these assets are greatly valuable or lacking.

In helping investors and creditors better value their businesses, managers can potentially expect stock price premiums and debt cost decreases (Li, 2010). In exchange for better information from fair value, investors should be willing to give premiums on the regular price of stock ceteris paribus (Li, 2010). In exchange for this better information, creditors should be willing to lower how much interest they expect (Christensen, Nikolaev, 2009). Creditors face less risk with more relevant numbers, and less risk results in lower demanded interest rates (Nissim, Penman, 1999). Lower interest rates increase profitability. Current investors would support maintaining management teams with the results of increasing stock prices and profitability. All these benefits potentially can result from this simple accounting choice.

There has also been some discussion of the choice of fair value increasing leverage (Christensen, Nikolaev, 2009). This term means that choosing to report what is collateral (property, plant, and equipment) at fair value encourages the financial institutions already providing debt to provide even more. The reason is that managers are responsible for the numbers reported for this collateral. Any improper valuations could establish the grounds for civil suit recourse. Thus, financial institutions face even less risk in choosing to lend more to these fair value reporting companies.

However, if all these benefits could result, every company would be expected to utilize fair value. Not every company does. The reasons include lack of knowledge of these benefits and the increased volatility of choosing fair value. Even though the fair value numbers are more helpful, what is surrendered is consistency (Ball, 2006). Choosing cost means the identical numbers are shown every reporting year save for impairments, which are not likely as cost numbers are so low already. Choosing fair value means that the reported numbers for property, plant, and equipment could decrease as well. Any decrease moves directly to the income statement as an immediate loss and reduction in profitability (IAS 16). Any increase generally moves to the statement of changes in equity and therein does not improve profitability (IAS 16). The exception to this increase being sent to the income statement is discussed later.

Investors and creditors would rather have consistently increasing profitability, not substantially volatile profitability (Nissim, Penman, 1999). There are investments that meet these conditions. Thus, companies falling outside these parameters face lower stock prices and higher

interest rates to compensate for the increased risk. Volatile profitability could diminish companies' capabilities to comply with debt covenants.

Earnings management can always be an issue. The quality of numbers increases with fair value and could result in that investor stock premium (Ball, 2006). However, investors want quality numbers in so many areas as possible. If management is utilizing fair value just to meet earnings targets, the quality of the reported information would decrease. This situation can have less than positive results.

The fair value method requires management teams to determine the value annually at their discretion but requires external valuation only every few years (IAS 16). Thus, choosing to get external valuation of property, plant, and equipment in the highest valuation year (great economic conditions with high prices) could signal bonus-increasing earnings management. Even markets for property, plant, and equipment are cyclical. Then, after the boom in values subsides, an economic downturn is likely to occur. In an economic downturn, the values of property, plant, and equipment can decline. Any decrease moves to the income statement as the reduction of profitability. However, because profitability is generally lower in economic downturns anyway, this extra decline in profitability could be described as resulting from economic conditions beyond management's control. As managers would not likely get any bonuses in economic downturns anyway, they could care less. However, as bonuses are based on annual results, this choice provides the greatest possible earnings management benefit to managers. In the next economic boom then, they can get the external valuation. Any increase in property values to the extent of restoring the value of losses recorded in previous years moves to the income statement as an increase in profitability (IAS 16). This increase in profitability then can get management to the top tiers of bonuses.

Management teams could also increase their bonuses through their choice of experts. They can choose certain external valuation experts known for providing higher values for property, plant, and equipment in that boom. Then, during the economic downturn, they could select those valuation experts known for providing lower values. This management opportunism should be limited at the time that the board of directors structures bonuses.

Whether the choice of fair value would significantly influence stock price premiums and interest rates remains to be determined over time. However, what other companies in certain industries are doing for reporting property, plant, and equipment is significant right now. In today's business world, the top company in every industry is benchmarked. Competitors seek to surpass that industry leader to reach that status. In this process then, other members of the industry tend to follow the reporting policies of that leader. Thus, this research can show management teams what others in their industry are doing for reporting so as to empower them to follow those reporting policies and compete for industry leadership.

The following seeks to determine what the management of the top companies located in Norway, Sweden, and Finland (as defined by being in the OBX Oslo 25, OMX Stockholm 30, OMX Helsinki 25) choose and then compare those results to what the management teams in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania (as defined by being in the OMX Baltic) select. Each

of these indices has the most successful or at least the largest market capitalization companies in each country or set of countries. With more property, plant, and equipment under management than for the smaller capitalized companies, these management teams likely allocated more time or designated more auditors' time to make the best decision possible. Thus, these decisions deserve greater discussion, not as necessarily being better, but as having been more reviewed. The following discusses the background, hypotheses, methods, results, potential implications for management teams worldwide, and generally the future.

More specifically, IAS 16 provides the choice for subsequent measurement of property, plant, and equipment after initial recognition at cost. The two choices are cost or fair value for that subsequent measurement. However, without regard to the choice, that amount is less any accumulated depreciation (not including any land) and impairment losses. For the fair value, it is less subsequent accumulated depreciation and subsequent impairment losses.

Hypotheses

HA: Because IFRS presumes that fair value is the better means to its objective of relevance, the choice of fair value under IAS 16 should predominate.

HB: Although Scandinavia and the Baltic states have different histories, sharing IFRS in common as their accounting standard should mean that, whatever the predominance of fair value in reporting under IAS 16, the rates of selecting fair value should not substantially differ between the two geographic areas. Also, the types of industries selecting fair value should not substantially differ between the two geographic areas.

Methods

HA: Management teams present their choices in the accounting policy disclosures within annual reports, so these items are reviewed to determine if they follow the IAS 16 revaluation method in accounting for property, plant, and equipment. Here, the formula to ascertain the percentage of companies involves the number of companies that follow that method over the total number of companies in each index.

HB: The results from the previous process are compared. Without question, any rate difference of 10 or more percent is significant. Also, the industrial classifications of companies whose management teams choose fair value under IAS 16 are determined from reviewing their annual reports and compared.

Results

HA: 2.5 percent of the OMX Nordic 40 here, 4 percent of the OBX Oslo 25, 3.3 percent of the OMX Stockholm 30, then 0 percent of the OMX Helsinki 25, (20 percent of Denmark's OMX 20 and 16.67 of Iceland's OMX 6), 24.32 percent of the OMX Baltic First (37), 26.67 percent of the Tallinn First, 0 percent of the Riga First, and 35.29 percent of the Vilnius First utilize the fair value method under IAS 16. The extraordinary result is that Latvian companies do not utilize the fair value method for property, plant, and equipment whereas Estonian and Lithuanian companies do.

Table 1

Companies Utilizing Fair Value as Percentage of All Companies in Each Index

OMX Baltic First	24.32%
OMX Tallinn First	6.67%
OMX Riga First	0.00%
OMX Vilnius First	35.29%
OMX Nordic 40	2.50%
OBX Oslo 25	4.00%
OMX Stockholm 30	3.30%
OMX Helsinki 25	0.00%
OMX Copenhagen 20	20.00%
OMX Iceland 6	16.67%

HB: The rates of utilizing fair value differ significantly between Scandinavia at 2.5 percent for the OMX Nordic 40 and the Baltic at 24.32 percent for the OMX Baltic First. The lack of Latvian companies utilizing fair value becomes more extraordinary in this comparison. With Finland as its neighboring country, the company managers in Estonia would be expected to make choices more in line with Finnish company managers. However, Latvian company managers seem to follow the Finnish trend of choosing cost over fair value in the valuation of property, plant, and equipment.

As expected, Baltic companies, being newer to the reporting process, feel freer to choose the fair value method. However, Scandinavian companies, with long histories of utilizing cost to present property, plant, and equipment in their financial statements, have greater momentum toward continuing with the cost method.

Only members of the financial industry select fair value for the Scandinavian countries. The financial industry provides the one fair value company in each of the OMX Nordic 40 (Investor), OMX Iceland 6 (Foroya), OBX Oslo 25 (Storebrand), and OMX Stockholm 30 (Investor).

However, in the OMX Baltic First, there are enough fair value companies that virtually every industry is represented: construction (Panevezio statybos trestas); consumer goods (Luterma (AS Kalev), Pieno zvaigzdes, Vilkyskiu pienine); financial (Invalda); retailing (Tallinna Kaubamaja); shipping (Tallink Grupp); and utilities (Rytu skirstomieji).

This difference between the Baltic companies and Scandinavian companies could result from years of experience with the financial reporting process. The Scandinavian company managers are just continuing with what they have always done, potentially not wanting to incur the costs necessary to change to fair valuing property. However, the Baltic company managers could have less years of enduring cost method reporting and therein not be as reluctant to move toward fair value method reporting.

The reason for Scandinavian companies choosing fair value for property, plant, and equipment more so in the financial industry could well be the result of having more assets already that have to be reported under the fair value system. Thus, the cost of implementing fair value reporting of property, plant, and equipment could be lower for them with

efficiencies that have been developed. The Baltic companies seem to have efficiencies present in many industries or at least consider the benefits of this fair value reporting to be greater than its costs.

Future research could consider whether audit standards differences between the regions could contribute toward these differences. If the audit standards do differ, then costs involved with choosing fair value could be more significant in Scandinavia than in the Baltic countries.

Other inquiries to be made include whether the expectations from choosing fair value (increasing stock prices and decreasing interest costs) do result and whether, after more years have passed, the fair value method is utilized even more. At the current moment, the standards are still new enough that trends could develop over time in each regard. As volatility from business cycles occurs, the Baltic companies could become more similar to the Scandinavian companies and choose cost. However, the Scandinavian companies could just as likely witness the benefits of choosing fair value from their neighboring Baltic companies and choose fair value.

Table 2

Discussion of Industry Utilization of Fair Value

Number of Companies Utilizing Fair Value in Each Index for Each Industry

	Baltic First	Nordic 40	Iceland 6	Oslo 25	Stockholm 30
Construction	1				
Consumer goods	4				
Financial	1	1	1	1	1
Retailing	1				
Shipping	1				
Utilities	1				

Names of Companies Utilizing Fair Value in Each Index for Each Industry

Baltic First	Nordic 40	Iceland 6	Oslo 25	Stockholm 30
Construction:				
Panevezio statybos trestas				
Consumer goods:				
Luterma				
(AS Kalev)				
Pieno zvaigzdes				
Vilkyskiu pienine				
Financial:	**Financial:**	**Financial:**	**Financial:**	**Financial:**
Invalda	Investor	Foroya	Storebrand	Investor
Retailing:				
Tallinna Kaubamaja				
Shipping:				
Tallink Grupp				
Utilities:				
Rytu skirstomieji				

Implications

The fair value method has greater relevance as it provides more current numbers for property, plant, and equipment than the cost method does. However, the fair value method also requires more expenses than the cost method to get those numbers. Investors should be sophisticated enough to discount any effect on earnings from fair value companies to compare them to historical cost companies. Also, creditors appreciate having fair value on property, plant, and equipment for purposes of assessing collateral in making decisions. However, they are still likely to utilize their own means to determine the fair value of those collateralized assets. Thus, the benefit greater than the cost in more Baltic companies would seem to be from greater market inefficiencies there, different means of management compensation there, greater capability to disclose future earning potential through choice of fair value, or some other reason.

Geography does not support why the Baltic countries would have the significantly greater percentage of companies adopting fair value than the Scandinavian countries. Even the Baltic countries' immediate neighbors to the west, Finland and Poland then, have close to 0 percent adoption of fair value in their top companies.

After acknowledging this fair value choice trend, management teams should also consider their industry. If they are in the financial industry, then resorting to the fair value method could become an even better option.

Any board of directors dealing with bonuses in the midst of possible fair value choices now must consider whether there should be new provisions. The board of directors could base bonuses on changing reported financial numbers to show what the results would have been under the cost method. Also, lower bonuses could be provided to take into consideration the fact that it sometimes can be easier to reach certain targets with the fair value choice. This issue can be discussed more in future projects.

Of interest in the future would be the results of choosing fair value for investment properties. However, these properties are not the essence of most business operations because they are not the primary revenue and profits contributors. Property, plant, and equipment generate the products for sale, which is the essence of most businesses. Thus, this inquiry into IAS 16 choices has been of far greater importance than any inquiry into IAS 40 choices.

As time passes then, these trends in cost and fair value choices could change. However, Baltic company managers and Scandinavian company managers should consider this research. Producing profits through primary operations should always be their emphasis and means for being evaluated. At the same time, choices of accounting methods can sometimes have an equally significant effect on their profitability and evaluations.

References

1. Armstrong, C. S., Barth, M. E., Jagolinzer, A. D., Riedl, E. J. (2010). Market Reaction to the Adoption of IFRS in Europe / / The Accounting Review. Vol. 85, No. 1.
2. Ball, R. (2006). International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS): Pros and Cons for Investors / / Accounting and Business Research. Special Issue.
3. Cairns, D., Massoudi, D., Taplin, R., Tarca, An. (2009). IFRS Fair Value Measurement and Accounting Policy Choice in the UK and Australia.- Working paper, London School of Economics, Department of Accounting.
4. Christensen, H. B., Nikolaev, V. (2009). Does Fair Value Accounting for Non-Financial Assets Pass the Market Test?- Working paper, University of Chicago, Department of Accounting.
5. International Accounting Standards Board. (2010). IAS 16 Property, Plant, and Equipment. Internet access: http://www.iasb.org/. [Accessed January 1, 2010].
6. International Accounting Standards Board. (2010). IAS 40 Investment Properties. Internet access: http://www.iasb.org/. [Accessed January 1, 2010].
7. Legenzova, R. (2007). Accounting Regulation Changes in Lithuania: An Assessment.- Working paper, Vytautas Magnus University, Department of Accounting.
8. Li, S. (2010). Does Mandatory Adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards in the European Union Reduce the Cost of Equity Capital? / / The Accounting Review. Vol. 85, No. 2.
9. Nissim, D., Penman, S. H. (1999). Ratio Analysis and Equity Valuation.- Working paper, Columbia University, Department of Accounting.
10. OMX Nasdaq. (2010). Internet access: http://www.nasdaqomxnordic.com/. [Accessed January 1, 2010].
11. Oslo Bors. (2010). Internet access: http://www.oslobors.no/. [Accessed January 1, 2010].

The paper submitted: May 20, 2010
Prepared for publication: November 30, 2010

Kevin A. DIEHL

SKANDINAVIJOS IR BALTIJOS ŠALYS: KOKIA PRAKTIKA ĮSIVYRAUS FINANSINĖSE ATASKAITOSE ATSKLEIDŽIANT ILGALAIKĮ MATERIALŲJĮ TURTĄ IR KAIP TAI PAVEIKS ĮMONIŲ STRATEGIJĄ?

S a n t r a u k a

Tyrimų, kurie nagrinėtų Baltijos ir Skandinavijos šalių įmonių ilgalaikio materialiojo turto atskleidimą finansinėse ataskaitose akcentuojant savikainą ar tikrąją vertę, beveik nėra. Todėl straipsnio autorius siekia apibrėžti tendencijas vyraujančias finansinėse ataskaitose minėtose šalyse. Vadovaujantis tarptautiniais finansinės atskaitomybės standartais (TFAS) ir tarptautiniu 16-tuoju verslo apskaitos standartu (TVAS) įmonių vadovams, apskaitant ilgalaikį materialųjį turtą finansinėse ataskaitose, tenka rinktis ką atskleisti: turto savikainą ar tikrąją vertę. Baltijos šalių viešų prekybos kompanijų vadovai turi šiuo klausimu apsispręsti kasmet, todėl informacija analizuojanti pasirinkimo privalumus ir trūkumus jiems yra svarbi. Atskleidimo pasirinkimas gali turėti įtakos ir pačių vadovų darbui, kadangi tikrosios turto vertės atskleidimas finansinėse ataskaitose gali lemti didesnę akcijų kainą ir mažesnes palūkanų normas.

Nors Skandinavijos šalys turi daugiau patirties viešai pateikiant ataskaitas, tačiau vis dar yra daug bendrų sąlyčio taškų su Baltijos šalių ekonomika. Todėl šis regionas yra ypač patrauklus norint palyginti rezultatus.

Norėdamas surinkti duomenis ir nustatyti, kaip ilgalaikį materialųjį turtą apskaito regiono įmonės ir kokios tendencijos vyrauja, autorius tyrinėja 2009 metų metines apskaitos ataskaitas visų kompanijų, kurios dalyvauja akcijų biržoje; analizuojami indeksai. Įvertinamas kiekvienos kompanijos internetinis puslapis. Per informaciją apie investuotojų duomenis prieinama prie 2009 m.

metinės ataskaitos. Metinėje ataskaitoje pasirinktos apskaitos strategija yra paaiškinama ir pateikiama po finansinėmis ataskaitomis. Šiose išnašose atsiskleidžia, kokį metodą tam tikra kompanija taiko apskaitydama savo ilgalaikį materialųjį turtą: savikainos ar tikrosios vertės.

Šiame straipsnyje apžvelgiamos Skandinavijos šalių kompanijų ataskaitos siekiant nustatyti, koks turto apskaitymo būdas ten vyrauja. Autorius apskaičiuoja procentus – kiek procentų verslo įmonių naudoja vieną apskaitymo būdą ir kiek kitą – ir palygina juos su Baltijos šalių rodikliais. Kadangi Skandinavijoje vadovai veikia panašioje verslo aplinkoje kaip ir Baltijos šalių verslininkai, šis palyginimas leidžia daryti naudingas įžvalgas. Kompanijos dirbančios finansų šakoje, kurių veikla ir taip yra susijusi su ilgalaikio materialiojo turto tikrąja verte, yra linkusios ir apskaitoje tokį turtą atskleisti naudojant jo tikrąją vertę. Vertinant metines ataskaitas galima nustatyti įmonės šaką, kurioje ji dirba pagal tai, ar ji naudoja apskaitoje tikrąją vertę.

Pirmiausia remiantis kompanijų, prekiaujančių OMX Baltic First, OMX Tallinn First, OMX Riga First ir OMX Vilnius First vertybinių popierių biržose, metinėmis ataskaitomis išsiaiškinama, kokią duomenų atskleidimo strategiją naudoja analizuojamos kompanijos. Po to išanalizavus Skandinavijos kompanijų, prekiaujančių OMX Nordic 40, OBX Oslo 25, OMX Stockholm 30, OMX Helsinki 25, OMX Copenhagen 20 ir OMX Iceland 6 vertybinių popierių biržose, duomenų atskleidimo strategiją, palyginamos abiejų regionų tendencijos.

Gauti duomenys parodė, kad Baltijos šalyse 24.32 proc. kompanijų prekiaujančių OMX Baltic First biržoje savo apskaitoje naudoja ilgalaikio materialiojo turto tikrąją vertę. Tuo tarpu Skandinavijoje tik 2.50 proc. kompanijų prekiaujančių OMX Nordic 40 biržoje tokiu būdu apskaito turtą.

Tyrimo išvadų svarba yra neabejotina. 8-tasis tarptautinės apskaitos standartas dabar leidžia įmonių vadovams patiems kasmet peržiūrėti ir pasirinkti jiems labiausiai tinkantį ilgalaikio turto vertės nustatymo būdą. Taigi Baltijos šalyse vyraujanti tendencija įvertinti ilgalaikį turtą tikrąja verte gali paskatinti ir kitas to regiono kompanijas, dirbančias ne finansų šakoje ir naudojančias savikainos būdą, permąstyti savo strategiją ir pasirinkti minėtą apskaitymo būdą. Panašu, kad tai gali būti priimtina bet kurioje šakoje.

Tuo tarpu Skandinavijos kompanijoms verta pagalvoti, ar jų pasirinktas turto apskaitymas remiantis savikaina yra naudingas.