



ACCOUNTING STANDARDS AND REVALUATION OF ASSETS: INVESTIGATING THE EFFECT ON FINANCE WITH AN OVERVIEW OF IFRS AND GAAP

DR. MOHAMMED ABID ¹ | MILKI THAKUR ²

¹ ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, PACIFIC ACADEMY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND RESEARCH UNIVERSITY, UDAIPUR.

² SCHOLAR, BACHELOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, PACIFIC ACADEMY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND RESEARCH UNIVERSITY, UDAIPUR.

ABSTRACT:

Revaluation of assets is perhaps the most controversial topic in financial reporting, especially since it is based on the inherent differences between International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) and Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). Though IFRS allows periodic revaluation of long-lived assets to fair market value, GAAP takes a more conservative stance, forbidding such revaluations in most cases except for marketable securities. This review investigates the effects on financial transparency, investment choices, and cross-border comparability of these disparate practices. Through a review of the literature, we discuss the theoretical underpinnings, pragmatic implications, and current controversies of asset revaluation practice. The rationale implies that whereas IFRS-based revaluations might improve financial transparency by about 95% relative to GAAP's 89%, concerns remain over volatility introduction and subjective valuation issues. The paper integrates existing research to offer insights for standard setters, practitioners, and scholars in the face of this intricate environment.

KEYWORDS:

ASSET REVALUATION, IFRS, GAAP, FINANCIAL REPORTING, FAIR VALUE ACCOUNTING, ACCOUNTING STANDARDS.

PAPER ACCEPTED DATE:

17th September 2025

PAPER PUBLISHED DATE:

18th September 2025

PAPER DOI NO:

10.5281/zenodo.17150228

PAPER DOI LINK:

<https://zenodo.org/records/17150228>

INTRODUCTION

The issue of how to value assets on company balance sheets has been the source of debate for decades in accounting ranks. Do we rely on historical cost—accurate, verifiable, but maybe not relevant? Or follow fair value methods that mirror economic reality but bring volatility and subjectivity? This basic conflict comes to the forefront when comparing the opposing philosophies of IFRS and GAAP when it comes to revaluing assets.

The environment grows even more complicated when we factor in that adoption of IFRS was found to increase financial transparency by 95%, versus 89% for GAAP, but this increased transparency is accompanied by trade-offs worth scrutinizing. The real-world applications go beyond simple accounting theory—they have implications for how investors analyze companies, how executives make strategic decisions, and how markets operate around the world.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

BASIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IFRS AND GAAP

The philosophical split between GAAP and IFRS on the revaluation of assets stems from deeper accounting

ideology differences. Revaluation under GAAP is only allowed for marketable securities, a conservative stance that values reliability and consistency at the expense of relevance to current markets. This is what many describe as GAAP's past focus on verifiability and objectivity.

By contrast, under IFRS, assets can subsequently be revalued to fair value, whether this is up or down. This gives firms the ability to report assets at amounts that theoretically more accurately represent their economic substance, although it raises issues of comparability and the possibility of earnings management.

The difference also applies to certain asset classes. IFRS enables certain intangible assets to be revalued and depreciated, reflecting their true value. GAAP is more rigid, with adherence to original costs of purchase and not allowing revaluation. The difference assumes added importance in industries that are knowledge-based, where intangible assets are large percentages of firm value.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND STANDARD-SETTING CONSIDERATIONS

The theoretical basis for asset revaluation raises core

issues regarding the purpose of financial reporting. Among the primary standards that apply to asset revaluation is IAS 16, which addresses property, plant, and equipment, setting the conceptual framework in place under which companies are able to select cost or revaluation models.

Yet the challenge is more than a technical one. The underlying concept in IAS 36 is that an asset cannot be presented in the financial statements at higher than the maximum amount to be recovered from its use or disposal. The concept puts pressure on the tension between fair value measurement and impairment considerations, exemplifying the complexity of contemporary asset valuation methodologies.

Standard-setting research indicates that standard-setting inferences one can derive from value relevance research studies motivated by standard setting need to be appraised thoroughly for underlying theory. This observation is most relevant when evaluating revaluation policy real-world influence.

FINANCIAL REPORTING QUALITY AND MARKET IMPACT

The revaluation practices debate ultimately revolves around their effect on financial reporting quality and decision usefulness. Revaluation of assets is an important part of financial reporting that realigns the book value of assets with the assets' current market value, informing stakeholders. Accuracy, however, becomes relative when presented with illiquid assets or sophisticated valuation schemes.

Studies that investigate financial reporting relevance indicate troubling trends. There is a prevalent and increasing discontent with the relevance and usefulness of financial report data, especially by investors and business management. This discontent about whether existing revaluation methods are meeting user requirements is troubling.

The complexity deepens when dealing with individual industries. We evidence inconsistency between International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) and Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) as well as distortions that lead users astray in evaluating asset value, liquidity, profitability, and cash-generating capacity, especially in new domains such as cryptocurrency accounting.

CROSS-BORDER IMPLICATIONS AND CONVERGENCE CHALLENGES

The real-world ramifications of differing revaluation methods reach beyond single-firm reporting to influence cross-border investment and market efficiency. With IFRS, firms may use the U.S. GAAP approach or revalue their long-lived assets at fair market value periodically—recognizing increases and recoveries as well as impairments in asset values. Although theoretically desirable in its flexibility, such an approach is problematic for multinational investors seeking to compare firms in different jurisdictions.

Conservative GAAP is an expression of deeper philosophical assumptions. U.S. GAAP effectively relies in most situations on a conservative "lower-of-" philosophy that emphasizes the importance of reliability over relevance. Conservatism has benefited some stakeholder groups, most importantly those who provide debt since they enjoy more stable asset values.

The research papers here presented present further insights that shed light on the past context of financial reporting difficulties. Mehta's research into the composition of past tax revenue highlighted the impact of alternative measurement processes on stakeholder decision-making, and Ahmed and Mehta's (2023) examination of the review role in purchasing decisions emphasizes the relevance of the quality of information in economic transactions—a principle that can easily be applied to financial reporting requirements.

Choudhary and Madhwani's (2013) analysis of recession effects on hospitality illustrates the impact of economic uncertainty on asset values, lending support to frequent revaluation strategies. Likewise, Chaplot's (2018) research in strategic management implies that performance measurement systems have significant effects on organizational performance, mirroring how revaluation policies impact corporate reporting incentives.

The pandemic effect research works by Sharma, Dadhich, and Chauhan (2022) offer modern-day evidence of the impact of external shocks on financial metrics, supporting the relevance debate in the case of historical cost versus current value methods. Dave and Paliwal's (2016) study on consumer perceptions offers methodological lessons for stakeholder surveys about financial reporting choices.

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The evidence portrays a complex portrait of asset revaluation effects. While IFRS methodologies can strengthen transparency controls, they also add complexity that may not serve all groups of stakeholders equally. The challenge is not merely one of selecting between alternative approaches, but of comprehending how varying contexts—industry types, economic conditions, regulatory settings—shape the ideal trade-off between reliability and relevance.

Future research might profitably examine how technological advances in valuation methods could address some traditional concerns about subjectivity in fair value measurement. Additionally, behavioral research exploring how different user groups actually utilize revaluation information could inform standard-setting decisions.

The continued development of business models, especially in knowledge-intensive and digital sectors, continues to put pressure on conventional asset ideas. This research is concerned with the waning applicability of financial data related to existing financial reporting frameworks for intangible assets, indicating that existing controversies are likely in need of radical reconceptualization instead of gradual improvement.

CONCLUSION

Asset revaluation is a rich area for continuous research and standard-setting. The evidence is that neither historical cost nor unqualified fair value methods represents the best solution in all situations. Rather, the task is to create frameworks that balance in a proper way reliability, relevance, comparability, and understandability for various needs of stakeholders.

The large differences between GAAP and IFRS on matters of revaluation mirror more profound philosophical disagreements regarding the capital markets' role of financial reporting. As convergence continues, the persistence of such differences indicates that obtaining common ground first means working through core issues related to measurement objectives and user priorities.

Most notably, perhaps, the study emphasizes the necessity of ongoing dialogue among standard setters, practitioners, and researchers to ensure that revaluation policies fulfill their aim of improving decision-useful financial information. The stakes continue to be high—asset valuation right has consequences for resource allocation decisions that eventually influence economic outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Z. K., & Mehta, B. (2023). Role of Reviews in Online Purchasing of Home Furnishing Items. *Pacific Business Review International*, 16(4).
- Chaplot, D. (2017). Job satisfaction is step towards success:-a study of max life insurance. *An international Peer Reviewed & Referred Scholarly Research Journal for interdisciplinary studies*, 5616-5630.
- Chaplot, D. (2018). An impact of strategic management on the performance of organization: An empirical investigation on selected organization of Rajasthan. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*, 5(3), 1537-1543.
- Choudhary, P. D., & Madhwani, R. (2013). AN ANALYTICAL STUDY OF IMPACT OF RECESSION ON TOURISM & HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 17(2).
- Dave, K. K., & Paliwal, R. (2016). A study on consumer perception on malted health food drinks in Udaipur city. *International Journal of Management and Corporate Affairs (IJARS)*, 2(5), 1-27.
- Financial Accounting Standards Board. (2023). *Accounting Standards Codification*. FASB.
- International Accounting Standards Board. (2023). *International Financial Reporting Standards*. IFRS Foundation.
- International Financial Reporting Standards Foundation. (2024). *IAS 16 Property, Plant and Equipment*. IFRS Foundation.
- International Financial Reporting Standards Foundation. (2024). *IAS 36 Impairment of Assets*. IFRS Foundation.
- Mehta, A. Tax Revenue Composition: A Relative Assessment.
- Mehta, A., & Hiran, D. (2023). Methods for Managing Change in Medium Size Business Organizations of Small Cities. *ASM Group of Institutes, Pune, India*, 6.
- Mishra, A. K., & Celestin, M. (2025). IFRS vs. GAAP: How Differences in Accounting Standards Impact Financial Reporting, Cross-Border Investments, and Multinational Decision-Making. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5239479>
- Penman, S. H. (2007). Financial reporting quality: Is fair value a plus or a minus? *Accounting and Business Research*, 37(sup1), 33-44.
- Ramanna, K., & Watts, R. L. (2012). Evidence on the use of unverifiable estimates in required goodwill impairment. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 17(4), 749-780.
- Ryan, S. G. (2008). Accounting in and after the subprime crisis. *The Accounting Review*, 83(6), 1605-1638.
- Sharma, R., Dadhich, M., & Chauhan, K. (2022). The Impact Assessment of Pandemic on Financial Indicators of Selected BSE Listed Companies: A Comprehensive View. *Int. Res. J. Eng. Technol.*, 9(2), 483-494.
- Watts, R. L. (2003). Conservatism in accounting part I: Explanations and implications. *Accounting Horizons*, 17(3), 207-221.
- Zeff, S. A. (2007). Some obstacles to global financial reporting comparability and convergence at a high level of quality. *The British Accounting Review*, 39(4), 290-302.