

647 | 15

Views | CrossRef citations to date | Altmetric

0

Regular articles

Decline in Financial Reporting for Joint Ventures? Canadian Evidence on Removal of Financial Reporting Choice

A. William Richardson, Raafat R. Roubi & Kazbi Soonawalla

Pages 373-393 | Received 01 Sep 2007, Accepted 01 Nov 2010, Published online: 15 Mar 2011

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180.2011.558298>

Sample our
Economics, Finance,
Business & Industry Journals
>> [Sign in here](#) to start your access
to the latest two volumes for 14 days

Full Article

Figures & data

References

Citations

Metrics

Reprint

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 878 partners store and access personal data, like browsing data or unique identifiers, on your device. Selecting I Accept enables tracking technologies to support the purposes shown under we and our partners process data to provide. Selecting Reject All or withdrawing your consent will disable them. If trackers are disabled, some content and ads you see may not be as relevant to you. You can resurface this menu to change your choices or withdraw consent at any time by clicking the Show Purposes link on the bottom of the webpage. Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. [Here](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

Use precise geolocation data. Actively scan device

I Accept

Reject All

Show Purpose



s Generally
etting a
C) to
ard (IASB)
and PC and
ed. The past
e same two
Canada and
the period
our
reporting

methods for joint ventures. Therefore, our results have particular relevance for

evaluating the IASB's proposed change. Specifically, we investigate whether firms that use EM between 1985 and 1994 experience a decline in value relevance of key balance sheet amounts such as total assets and liabilities when forced to use PC from 1995 onwards. Since 1995 firms are also required to provide footnote disclosures on their share of joint venture assets and liabilities in addition to revenues, expenses and cash flows. Using these disclosures, we investigate whether disaggregate joint venture assets and liabilities are incrementally and overall value relevant. We find that firms that are forced to switch from EM to PC experience a decline in value relevance of reported assets and liabilities. The firms that use PC for the entire sample period experience no such decline. We also find that joint venture assets and liabilities are incrementally and overall value relevant when disclosures are mandatory from 1995 onwards. Our results show that the removal of choice of financial reporting method does have value-relevance implications, something that is of importance to users. We also find that the requirement of additional disclosure of joint venture assets and liabilities is value relevant, which may offset, to some extent, the costs of the reduction in choice. Our inferences may have implications for a number of jurisdictions across Europe and beyond that are affected by a similar reduction of accounting choice proposed by the IASB.

Acknowledgements

We thank
this project
Accounting
ventures
Manit
edito
Bhimani
commer



support of
Chartered
ing joint
niversity of
thank the
y Barth, Al
helpful

Notes

All EU listed firms were required to adopt IFRS in 2005, so IAS 31 automatically became the standard for listed UK firms from 2005 onwards.

Under the gross equity method disaggregate shares of joint venture revenues, earnings, assets and liabilities are disclosed on the face of the financial statement in addition to equity method recognition.

For example, Canada is in the process of adopting IFRS in full by 2011 (CICA, [2007](#)), and in 2007, the Australian Accounting Standards Board modified their accounting standards so that they are identical to IFRS as issued by the IASB.

Joint ventures are jointly controlled by co-venturer firms where joint control is the sharing of power between venturer firms. No single firm unilaterally controls the joint ventures, and joint consent of all venturers is required for major operating and financing policy decisions.

The cost method, which reports only dividends received as income, was recommended in cases where the equity from the joint venture was not likely to accrue to the co-venturer or there had been a loss of joint control.

Revised CICA 3055 defines a joint venture as 'an economic activity resulting from a contractual arrangement whereby two or more venturers jointly control the economic activity' (CICA 3055.02)

Commer

The inde

Only one

and ther

observat

It is b

determin

David M

names o

compari

provided

C one year

whether this


or its

ice.

ed the

ple by

who kindly



Rather than trying to investigate how value relevance for firms in general changes over time our study examines how value relevance changes for the same firms over time.

Because the original Section 3055 allowed a choice between EM and PC, we need not be concerned with the issue of early adopters. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that there was a relatively short time between the release of the exposure draft (June 1993) and finalisation of the revised Section 3055 (October 1994).

The proportion of firm-years in each time period is close to the proportion of number of years in each 10-year time period: 50.3% for 1985-94 and 49.7% for 1995-2003.

These pre-1995 amounts are not used in the regression analysis and are hence untabulated. We believe the pre-1995 set of firms disclosing share of joint venture assets and liabilities is too small to perform any rigorous and conclusive analysis.

Untabulated statistics show that for each year in 1985-94, when choice was permitted, PC was by far the method of choice. On average PC was chosen 68.7% of the time compared to 31% for EM. Untabulated statistical tests show that the PC to EM distribution rejects the assumption of a 50:50 distribution at the 1% level for each of the 10 years in the sample.

For example, suppose a company's primary business is low risk but it has large joint venture investments in high risk industries and the joint venture investment is small. Under EM, the company would have to disclose the business risk, core risk, and joint venture risk, whereas under PC, the company would only disclose the business risk and joint venture risk. The coefficient on the joint venture risk variable in both periods is positive, indicating that the decline in the disclosure of scenario risk is accounted for by the disclosure of the nature of assets and liabilities. The company would have to refer to the joint venture company as a joint venture, whereas under PC, the company would have to refer to the joint venture as a joint venture.



Investigating each of these possibilities is beyond the scope of this study. However, they stand as reasonable explanations for the decline in value relevance of accounting amounts experienced by firms that chose EM in the former period.

In further specifications, O'Hanlon and Taylor ([2007](#)), distinguish between associate and joint venture liability disclosures incremental to assets and liabilities reported under EM. These additional aspects are beyond the scope of our study.

Bauman ([2003](#)) includes indicator variables for investor guaranteed and non-guaranteed debt. However, this is beyond the scope of our data and analysis.

Additional information

Notes on contributors

A. William Richardson

Paper accepted by Salvador Carmona.

Raafat R. Roubi

Paper a

Kazbi S

Paper a

Re



Information for


- Authors
- R&D professionals
- Editors
- Librarians
- Societies

Opportunities

- Reprints and e-prints
- Advertising solutions
- Accelerated publication
- Corporate access solutions

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

 Sign me up



Copyright

Accessib

Registered
5 Howick Pl

Open access

- Overview
- Open journals
- Open Select
- Dove Medical Press
- F1000Research

Help and information

- Help and contact
- Newsroom
- All journals
- Books



or & Francis Group
orma business

