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Abstract: This study aims to determine effect of ownership structure on revaluation of fixed assets with tax incentives as a moderating variables. The ownership structure is indicated by company size, intensity of fixed assets, price ratio to book value and leverage. The data used in this study are secondary data obtained from the annual reports of companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) which amounted to 198 manufacturing companies in 2014 and 2015. This study uses purposive sampling with a logistical analysis model. The results of this study indicate that firm size, intensity of fixed assets, and leverage do not affect the revaluation of fixed assets, while the price ratio towards book value has negative effects on the revaluation of fixed assets. In addition, tax incentives is not a moderate variables.

INTRODUCTION

Tax is a mandatory contribution in a community. For a country, tax is the largest revenue. The state revenue can be in a form of other income, grants, contributions as well as taxes (Nordiawan, et. al., 2010). The income is managed by the state for the welfare of the entire community. In 2015, Indonesia targeted tax revenues of Rp 1,294 trillion. In order to meet the large tax target, the government stipulates PMK No. 191/PMK.010/2015 which regulates the tax rate on fixed asset revaluation. The previous final PPh rates of 10% fell to 3% per October 20, 2015 to December 31, 2015. On January 1, 2016 to June 30, 2016, it became 4% and 6% for July 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016. Such target is made by the government, so that many companies revalue their fixed assets and to increase revenues from the tax sector. However, in fact, the strategy was unsuccessful. At the end of November, tax revenues were still far from expectations. Reported from the website of the Directorate General of Taxes, the budget realization until November 30, 2015 was Rp. 876.975 trillion. This amount, if calculated, only reaches 67.6% of the tax target. The failure of the realization of tax revenue also affected the resignation of Sigit Priadi Pramudito from his position as Director General of Taxes.

This problem is necessary to discuss, because as mentioned earlier, tax is the largest revenue of the country. With this income, the government can have developments to improve the welfare of the community through planned programs. If a country’s income is insufficient, the planned programs will be hampered and will also have an impact on the country’s development.

Some studies have revealed several factors which affect the revaluation of fixed assets. In the research of Lin and Peasnell (2000), revaluation is positively influenced by debt, company size and asset intensity. Whereas in the research of Iatridis and Kilirgiotis (2012), the results show that the revaluation of fixed assets is influenced by company size, external operations, fixed asset intensity, leverage and acquisition. In the research of Choi, et., al (2013), companies are interested in revaluing fixed assets if the number of assets owned is large, having high leverage ratio, requiring large funds and having been revalued. In the domestic research itself, Yulistia, et. al., (2015) found no factors that significantly affected asset revaluation. In Brazil, fixed asset revaluation research was conducted by Lopes and Walker (2012). In this study the price ratio of book value, assets, fixed assets, liquidity, external debt, year and asset depletion assets have a positive effect on revaluation of fixed assets. In Sweden, the study was conducted by Pierra (2007). In the study, leverage, ownership status, international stakeholders and company size have a positive effect on revaluation of fixed assets.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Research on asset revaluation has been conducted in a particular research in Brazil, Lopes and Walker (2012). It indicated that the price to book value ratio, assets, fixed assets, liquidity, external debt, year, and asset depletion had a positive effect on asset revaluation. The study used a sample of all types of companies except financing and insurance types from 1998 to 2004. Previous studies on asset revaluation was conducted by Lin and Peasnell (2000). The research was conducted in the UK with samples of 1106 and 1083 in 1998 and 1991 respectively. Revaluation was positively affected by debt, company size and asset intensity as the result of the study.

In Piera (2007), this study concluded that the revaluation of fixed assets is affected by leverage, ownership status, international stakeholders and company size. This research was conducted in 1994, 1997 and 2000. The samples used in each year include 96, 95 and 103 companies. Iatridis and Kilirgiotis (2012) also conducted research in the UK and obtained results that revaluation of fixed assets is influenced by company size, external operations, fixed asset intensity, leverage and acquisition. This research was conducted with a sample of 239 companies in 2007. The result of this study also showed that there was a negative effect of profit management on revaluation of fixed assets. In the research of Choi, et., al (2013) conducted in Korea, it indicates that companies are interested in revaluing fixed assets if the number of assets owned is large, having high leverage ratio, requiring large funds and having been revalued. The
Study was conducted on 302 companies and used the variable of land assets intensity, leverage, equity depletion measure, cash flow, profit, past revaluations, and the price to book value ratio. In domestic research, Yulistia, et al., (2015) found no factors that significantly affected asset revaluation. The research was conducted in 2012 and 2013 using a total sample of 226 companies. The different results make the researcher interested in conducting a research regarding the revaluation of fixed assets.

Based on the conceptual structure, the hypotheses of this study are:

**Company Size**

In large companies, managers certainly want financial statements to look better. It motivates managers to choose the revaluation method rather than the cost method. Besides, the larger the company, the greater the responsibility of the company to present financial statements that seem better. Size is also used in the previous studies. In the research of Iatridis and Kilirgiotis (2012), Lin and Peasnell (2000) and Piera (2007), assets have a positive effect on asset revaluation. Meanwhile, in domestic research, Yulistia, et al., (2015) concluded that company size had no significant effects. From those studies, it can be concluded that the first hypothesis of this study is:

\[ H_1: \text{Company size has a positive effect on asset revaluation.} \]

**Tax incentives moderate the influence of company size**

Previously it was stated that in large companies, managers tend to do asset revaluation because of tax incentive. Thus, the second hypothesis of this study is:

\[ H_2: \text{At normal tax rates, the relationship between assets and revaluation of fixed assets is weaker than the tax rates with incentives.} \]

**Fixed Asset Intensity**

The same as assets, if a particular company has a fairly large fixed asset, manager will certainly prefer the revaluation method compared to the cost method. It is done to gain profits and have a better financial statement. In Iatridis and Kilirgiotis (2012) and Lin and Peasnell (2000), the intensity of fixed assets has a positive effect on revaluation of fixed assets. In contrast to previous research, in the research of Yulistia, et al. (2015) fixed assets did not have a significant effect. The third hypothesis of this study is:

\[ H_3: \text{The intensity of fixed assets has a positive effect on asset revaluation.} \]

**Tax incentives moderate the intensity of fixed assets**

Just like fixed assets, tax rate can boost manager's motivation to revalue their assets. Managers will make use of tax incentives to revalue. Thus, the fourth hypothesis of this study is:

\[ H_4: \text{At normal tax rates, the relationship between fixed assets and revaluation of fixed assets is weaker than the tax rates with incentives.} \]

**Price to book value ratio**

In a company that has a price ratio to the ledger value, investors see it to have a potential. This definitely puts pressure on the management to measure up to investors’ expectations. Therefore, the share price according to a study by Louhichi (2008) can change rapidly once the company announces revenue. Managers will not do things that are at risk of reducing asset value. The risk of asset value that are over-recorded will cause the company to lose trust from investors. Ahmed, Hillier, and Tanusasmita (2011)
argue that this ratio describes the company’s future prospects. Managers tend to prefer the cost method rather than the revaluation method. The effect of the price ratio on the value of the book itself on revaluation decisions had been examined by Lin and Peasnell (2000) and et al., (2013). These studies indicated that the price to book value ratio had a negative effect on asset revaluation decisions. This is in line with the previous research (Lopes and Walker, 2012). As a result, the fifth hypothesis of this study is:

\[ H_5: \text{Price to book value ratio has a negative effect on asset revaluation} \]

**Tax incentives moderate leverage**

Tax rates can boost manager’s motivation to revalue. With the existence of tax incentives in the form of a reduction in tax rates, managers will revalue, so the sixth hypothesis of this study is:

\[ H_6: \text{At normal tax rate, the relationship between book price ratio to equity and the revaluation of fixed assets is weaker than the tax rate with incentives.} \]

**Leverage**

For companies whose capital is mostly debt, they will certainly try to improve their financial statements. By revaluing, it is expected that there will be an increase in asset value so that the proportion of assets is better. Leverage itself is used in the research of Iatridis and Kilirgiotis (2012) and Choi, et., al (2013). The study showed a fact that leverage has a positive effect on revaluation of fixed assets. Hence, the seventh hypothesis of this study is:

\[ H_7: \text{Leverage has a positive effect on asset revaluation.} \]

**Tax incentives moderate leverage**

The decrease in tax rates will motivate companies to revalue. One of the revaluations will provide the benefits of bettering financial statements. Therefore, the eighth hypothesis of this study is:

\[ H_8: \text{At normal tax rates, the relationship between leverage and revaluation of fixed assets is weaker than the tax rate with incentives.} \]

**Tax incentives**

In the time when there was a decrease in tax revaluation rates, the company will not miss the opportunity to revalue its fixed assets. Not only to increase assets, but also to display financial statements to suit its expected value. The final hypothesis of this study is:

\[ H_9: \text{Year has a positive effect on asset revaluation.} \]

**RESEARCH METHOD**

The population in this study is manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange from 2014 and 2015 which are 142 companies in total. The reason for including manufacturing companies is that manufacturing companies tend to have more fixed assets for their production needs. Hence, manufacturing companies are more likely to revalue their assets than other types of companies.

The sampling technique in this study is purposive sampling with the following criteria:

2. Manufacturing companies that have data availability and complete data needed during 2014 and 2015 during the period of study.
3. The manufacturing company’s annual financial statements are reported in rupiah.
4. Manufacturing companies that provide financial statements in December 31, 2014 and 2015.
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Table 1 Sample Selection Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2014 and 2015</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing companies that do not publish annual reports in 2014 and 2015</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing companies that have incomplete annual reports in 2014 and 2015</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing companies that present financial statements other than December 31, 2014 and 2015</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies that do not present 2014 and 2015 rupiah-denominated financial statements</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of samples in 2014 and 2015</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Variables and Operational Definitions**

This study uses dependent variables of fixed assets revaluation, and independent variables of company size, intensity of fixed assets, price to book value ratio, and leverage. In addition, this study also uses tax incentives as a moderating variable.

**Independent Variables**

**Company Size**

The size of a company describes how big a company is, which is usually determined by total assets. Company size is used in the research of Piera (2007), Iatridis and Kilirgiotis (2012), and Lin and Peasnell (2000). In this study, company size is calculated according to Lin and Peasnell (2000):

\[
Size = \ln (Total \ Assets)
\]

**Fixed Asset Intensity**

The intensity of fixed assets illustrates the percentage of the company’s fixed assets to total assets. Intensity is used in the research of Iatridis and Kilirgiotis (2012) and Lin and Peasnell (2000). The intensity of fixed assets is calculated by:

\[
INTENS = \frac{Fixed \ Assets}{Total \ Assets}
\]

**Price to Book Value Ratio**

Price to book value ratio is a comparison of stock prices with equity divided by book value. It is applied to assess whether or not a company is potential for investors. The price to book value ratio is used in the research of Lin and Peasnell (2000), Choi, et., al (2013), and Lopes and Walker (2012). In Subramanyam and Wild (2014), this ratio is calculated by dividing the market price per share with the book value per share. The price ratio of the book value is calculated by:

\[
\frac{MV}{BV} = \frac{Market \ price \ per \ share}{Book \ value \ per \ share}
\]

**Leverage**

Leverage is a comparison between debt and assets. Leverage is used in the research of Piera (2007), Iatridis and Kilirgiotis (2012), and Choi, et., al (2013). Leverage is calculated by:

\[
LEVERAGE = \frac{Total \ debtse}{Total \ Assets}
\]

**Moderating variable**

In this study, moderating variables are used. The moderating variable is tax incentives. The calculation of tax incentives are:

1 = if there is a revaluation of tax incentive in that year
0 = if there is no revaluation of tax incentive in that year
Dependent Variable

The dependent variable used in this study is asset revaluation. Based on Lin and Peasnell (2000) asset revaluation is calculated by:
1 = if the company revalues
0 = if the company does not revalue

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study uses logistic regression test to answer the effect of all independent variables on the dependent variables in the form of a dummy variable.

Descriptive statistics

In descriptive statistics, research is conducted on the mean (average value), standard deviation, minimum and maximum values. This is done to find out the overview of sample data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Results of Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(listwise)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Secondary data that has been processed

Model Feasibility Testing

Homeshaw and Lemeshow Test

Homeshaw and Lemeshow test is conducted to determine the compatibility between models with empirical data (Ghozali, 2011). The criteria of Homeshaw and Lemeshow test are as follows, if the statistics value of Homeshaw and Lemeshow Goodness-of-fit is > 0.05, then the model is accepted because it matches the empirical data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 Homeshaw and Lemeshow Test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Secondary data that has been processed

From the results of the SPSS output, there is a significance value of 0.589 which is greater than 0.05, which means the model is acceptable.

Model fit testing

In testing the fit model, the criterion is by looking at the statistical value -2LogL. This test is conducted to determine whether or not the addition of independent variables to the model will improve the model fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 Model Fit Test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Secondary data that has been processed

Testing the entire model

By testing the entire model, the value of Nagelkerke R Square can be seen. Nagelkerke R Square itself is the same as R Square in linear regression, which interprets how much the entire independent variable can describe the dependent variable. The greater the value of Nagelkerke R Square, the better the model is used.
Hypothesis testing

Wald test

Wald test is conducted to determine if an independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable. The Wald test itself is the same as the t test in linear regression. The criteria for the Wald test are:
1. If the significance value is < 0.05, then the hypothesis is accepted. It indicates that the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable.
2. If the significance value is > 0.05, then the hypothesis is rejected. It indicates that the independent variable has no significant effect on the dependent variable.

Table 6. Wald Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>3.237</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSITY</td>
<td>-.493</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>7.493</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATIO</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVERAGE</td>
<td>-.3,865</td>
<td>1,.729</td>
<td>4,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (Variable(s) entered on step 1: INTENSITY, RATIO, LEVERAGE)

Source: Secondary data that has been processed

The following are the results of data analysis used to answer the effect of all tax incentive variables on the revaluation of fixed assets in the form of dummy variables:

Model Fit Testing

Table 7 Model Fit Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>104.347</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Block</td>
<td>104.347</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>104.347</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Secondary data that has been processed

By using the chi square technique, research findings show that the independent variables have a significant and joint effect on the dependent variable, which is the revaluation of fixed assets. It is shown by the chi square value of 104,347 and significance value of 0.00 < 0.05.

Entire Model Testing

Table 8. Test results for the entire model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>-2 Log likelihood</th>
<th>Cox &amp; Snell R Square</th>
<th>Nagelkerke R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>182.021*</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Secondary data that has been processed

Based on Nagelkerke R square coefficient in the summary model, it can be concluded that independent variables give an influence by 65%.
Hypothesis Testing

Wald Test

Table 9. Wald Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>INSENTIF BY UKURAN</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.952</td>
<td>2953.999</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0999</td>
<td>7.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTENTIF BY INTENSITAS</td>
<td>-3.096</td>
<td>84509.500</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INSENTIF BY RASIO</td>
<td>-7.759</td>
<td>17548.036</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INSENTIF BY LEVERAGE</td>
<td>-3.322</td>
<td>20060.594</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.504</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>75.347</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Secondary data that has been processed

From the table, it can be concluded that tax incentives are not a moderate variable because in the Wald test, the overall value is < 0.05.

Discussion

The size of company positively affects the asset revaluation

The first hypothesis (H1) is rejected. Based on the results of study, the size of company has no effect on asset revaluation. This result is in line with the research conducted by Yulistia et al. (2015) and Nurjanah (2013), but contradict with the study of Seng & Su (2010). According to Yulistia et al. (2015), company size is not a factor that influences company managers to carry out upward revaluation.

At normal tax rates, the relationship between company size and revaluation of fixed assets is weaker than the tax rate that with incentives.

The second hypothesis (H2) is rejected. Tax incentives do not affect the relationship between assets and revaluation of fixed assets. Therefore it can be concluded that the size of a company does not affect the company in terms of revaluing assets. This is possible because the costs incurred in revaluing assets are not comparable to the tax imposed, thus large and small companies are not interested in doing so (Yulistia et al., 2015).

The intensity of fixed assets positively affects the asset revaluation

The third hypothesis (H3) is rejected. The results of this study are in line with the research by Yulistia et al. (2015) and the opposite of Nurjanah’s research (2013). According to Yulistia et al. (2015), the intensity of fixed assets does not affect the company in revaluing assets, because even though fixed assets are used in most of the operational activities of the company, it doesn’t become a major consideration for companies in revaluing fixed assets.

At normal tax rates, the relationship between fixed assets and revaluation of fixed assets is weaker than the tax rates with incentives.

The fourth hypothesis (H4) is rejected. Incentives do not affect the relationship between fixed assets and asset revaluation. This is due to the cost of revaluing assets. According to Yulistia et al. (2015), although there are incentives, the costs incurred in revaluing assets may still exceed the taxes that the company must pay.

Price ratio to book value negatively affects the asset revaluation

The fifth hypothesis (H5) is accepted. These results are in line with Andison’s research (2015), but deny Tay’s (2009) study. Ahmed, Hillier, and Tanusasmita (2011) argue that this ratio describes the company’s future prospects. If the ratio of stock prices to book value is higher, then it will affect the growth or undervalued assets, and if so, it decreases the policy of the company to revalue fixed assets (Lin and Peasnell, 2000).

At normal tax rates, the relationship between book price ratio to equity and the revaluation of fixed assets is weaker than the tax rate with incentives.

The sixth hypothesis (H6) is rejected. The presence or absence of an incentive tax rate does not affect the ratio of stock prices to book value on asset revaluation, because
the company focuses more on its debt contract. According to Lin and Peasnell (2000), debt contracts cannot be guaranteed without a sufficiently high proportion of intangible assets in the balance sheet, and hence, will affect the fixed asset revaluation policy.

**At normal tax rates, the relationship between leverage and revaluation of fixed assets is weaker than the tax rate with incentives.**

The seventh hypothesis (H7) is rejected. The results of this study indicate that leverage has no effect on asset revaluation, therefore the seventh hypothesis which states that the relationship between leverage and revaluation of fixed assets is weaker than the tax rate with incentives, is failed to be proven. The results of this study are the same as those that are conducted by Yulistia, but contradicts with the research by Piera (2000). According to Yulistia et al. (2015), revaluation as an effective accounting tool in increasing loan capacity is uncertain, because creditors can exclude a revaluation in the basis being used to calculate the debt ratio. Therefore, the size of leverage is not the company’s consideration to revalue assets.

**Year (period) positively affects the asset revaluation**

The eighth hypothesis (H8) is rejected. Although in 2014 to 2015 there was a tax incentive policy, it did not affect a company in revaluing assets. This may be due to cost constraints used to revalue fixed assets. According to Yulistia et al. (2015), asset revaluation requires large costs. Companies may not be interested in revaluing fixed assets because the revaluation costs are greater than the profit of tax incentives in a given year.

**CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

**Conclusion**

1. Company size does not affect asset revaluation.
2. Tax rates with incentives do not affect the relationship between the size of company and the revaluation of fixed assets.
3. The intensity of fixed assets has no effect on asset revaluation.
4. Tax rates with incentives do not affect the relationship between fixed assets and revaluation of fixed assets.
5. Price to book value ratio has a negative effect on asset revaluation.
6. Tax rates with incentives do not affect the relationship between the ratio of book prices to equity and the revaluation of fixed assets.
7. Tax rates with incentives do not affect the relationship between leverage and asset revaluation.
8. Year has no effect on asset revaluation.

**Suggestion**

1. To use other moderate variables affecting the revaluation of fixed assets.
2. To use other factors that affect the revaluation of fixed assets as independent variables.
3. To add samples of companies in different industries.
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