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Abstract

This monograph provides a historically informed discussion of conceptual and procedural issues related to the use of the fair value measurement attribute in financial reporting. Our goal is to provide a structure, based on the conceptual frameworks of the Financial Accounting Standards Board and International Accounting Standards Board, for researchers’ evaluations of empirical research studies that investigate the informational properties of all measurement bases, including fair values. We begin by defining, addressing misconceptions about, and providing a brief history of the fair value measurement attribute. We next discuss decision usefulness of fair value and other measurement bases, and describe and evaluate examples of empirical research that documents the decision usefulness of recognized and disclosed fair value information, focusing on predictive ability, value relevance, and risk relevance. We also discuss the role of verifiability in the context of relevant and faithfully represented accounting information; describe three untested, verifiability-related maintained assumptions that arise in discussions of fair-value-measurement research; and discuss research designs for investigating questions related to accounting measurement verifiability. Finally, we discuss claims that use of the fair value measurement attribute causes procyclical behavior among financial institutions and that accounting standards have become increasingly fair-value-oriented during the last two decades.

DOI: 10.1561/1400000030.
The purpose of this monograph is to discuss practical and conceptual issues related to fair value measurement in financial reporting and to evaluate certain research design aspects of empirical research that investigates the information properties of fair value measurement, both in an absolute sense and in comparison to other measurement bases. Although our primary focus is on fair value measurement, we believe that our evaluation of existing research and suggestions for future research are germane to researchers interested in examining the information properties of any accounting measurement basis. With regard to our discussions of research, we do not aim to review the extensive body of fair-value-measurement-related research that empirically tests the decision-usefulness of fair value measurements. For that coverage, we refer readers to reviews by Barth et al. [2001], Landsman [2007], and Ryan [2011] specifically, Section 4.4. Our discussions of individual research studies are intended to illustrate key points about the types of research questions that can and cannot be addressed with specific research designs, and not to provide an overview of research on fair value measurements.
Fair value measurement has been a controversial topic in the United States (U.S.) and elsewhere for more than a century. Advances in finance and accounting research, and much discussion, have not reconciled the conflicting perspectives of supporters and critics of using fair value measurement in financial statements. Indeed, after more than twenty years of research documenting the decision usefulness of disclosures about the fair values of financial instruments, standard setters are contemplating abolishing these disclosures for private companies. The 2008 financial crisis increased public scrutiny and brought accounting measurement to the forefront of policy debate, including debate characterized by polarizing rhetoric. Our intention with this monograph is to focus the discussion on the design and execution of rigorous, inferentially valid empirical research that can inform this debate.

We also present a historical overview of the use of fair value measurement based on the writings of prominent nineteenth and twentieth century accounting scholars. Here too, our aim is to dispel certain misunderstandings about the use of fair value measurement in the financial statements, and describe attributes of high quality research that investigates fair-value-measurement-related issues.

Except in the historical overview, we structure our discussion around the conceptual frameworks developed by the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) and International Accounting Standards Board (IASB). In particular, we analyze fair value measurements in the context of the qualitative characteristics of useful information (e.g., relevance, reliability, representational faithfulness) defined in (the now-superseded) Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts No. 2 (SFAC 2), *Qualitative Characteristics of Accounting Information* [FASB, 1980] and Chapter 3 of SFAC 8, *Qualitative Characteristics of Useful Financial Information* [FASB, 2010]. We also use

---

1In 2010, the FASB issued SFAC 8, which superseded SFAC 1, *Objectives of Financial Reporting by Business Enterprises* [FASB, 1978], and SFAC 2. Among numerous other changes, SFAC 8 replaced the SFAC 2 qualitative characteristic, “reliability,” with the qualitative characteristic, “representational faithfulness.” While it is no longer part of the conceptual framework, we discuss the notion of reliability because much of the empirical research described in this monograph includes pre-2010 sample periods and references to the conceptual framework.
the description of measurement attributes in SFAC 5, *Recognition and Measurement in Financial Statements of Business Enterprises* [FASB, 1984a]² We believe that structuring the discussion in this way has two advantages. First, the structure helps to link research, and our discussion of research, to the practical task of setting accounting standards guided by the conceptual framework. Second, it makes salient some of the difficulties encountered in the design and interpretation of research related to fair value measurement. For example, Sections 3 and 4 illustrate how the concepts of relevance and verifiability are empirically and conceptually intertwined and difficult to analyze individually, even with well-structured tests.

This rest of this monograph is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe the fair value measurement attribute as it is defined in FASB Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) Topic 820, and distinguish it from “fair value accounting,” an ambiguous, indeterminate phrase that appears to mean different things to different accounting researchers. We also provide evidence contrary to the view that financial reporting has increasingly adopted a “balance sheet approach” during the last three decades, including some implications of that view. We then compare fair value to other measurement attributes for the purpose of differentiating them. As we note, multiple measurement attributes may coincidentally have the same value at inception, and different patterns of change in subsequent periods. We next discuss potential decision criteria for choosing among alternative measurement bases in financial reporting, and close the section with a description of the development of the fair value measurement attribute during the twentieth century in the U.S.

²The objectives of financial reporting and the qualitative characteristics represent converged portions of the FASB’s and IASB’s conceptual frameworks. Specifically, Chapters 1 and 3 of SFAC 8 [FASB, 2010] are included in the 2010 update of the IASB’s conceptual framework. The measurement attributes included in SFAC 5 [FASB, 1984a] are mostly converged with the measurement attributes included in paragraphs 4.54–4.56 of the IASB’s conceptual framework. One exception is that “current market value” is included in SFAC 5, but is not in the IASB conceptual framework. In Subsection 2.3 of this monograph, we discuss the five measurement attributes included in SFAC 5. Interestingly, fair value is not included among the measurement attributes described in the FASB or IASB conceptual frameworks.
In Section 3, we discuss concepts related to the decision usefulness of financial statement elements measured using the fair value attribute. We begin with examples illustrating the decision-useful information conveyed by fair value measures, and the deficiencies in current U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) for investment securities and loans. We then describe empirical research that documents the decision usefulness of recognized and disclosed fair value information, focusing on predictive ability, value relevance and risk relevance. We end by describing two practical issues that arise with the use of disclosed (as opposed to recognized) fair value measurements in research assessing the decision usefulness of fair values.

In Section 4, we analyze the enhancing qualitative characteristic verifiability in the context of accounting measurement. We focus on verifiability because some prior research and commentaries claim that fair value is a particularly “unverifiable” measurement attribute. We argue that these analyses do not operationalize verifiability in a manner that is consistent with the conceptual framework, because these studies suggest, or assume, that verifiability is a determinative attribute of accounting measurement, independent of the measurement’s relevance or representational faithfulness. Because the conceptual framework is clear that accounting measurement must first maximize the joint qualities of relevance and faithful representation, a high level of verifiability of a measure cannot compensate for that measure’s lack of relevance or lack of faithful representation.

We next discuss three verifiability-related maintained assumptions: (1) that historical-cost-based accounting information is inherently more verifiable than fair-value-based accounting information, (2) that differential value relevance of fair value measurements is caused by differential measurement verifiability, and (3) that, compared to fair-value-based financial information, historical-cost-based financial information is inherently superior for contracting and stewardship purposes. We suggest that these assumptions represent testable hypotheses and that failure to validate these assumptions limits inferences in many studies. We end Section 4 with a discussion of research designs for investigation of measurement-reliability issues. In evaluating research designs, we emphasize the importance of a
Introduction

thorough understanding of the relevant accounting standards and concepts as a basis for developing predictions about relevance, representational faithfulness, and verifiability, and for distinguishing the effect of information about firms’ holdings of assets and liabilities from the effect of non-accounting-based economic characteristics, and changes in characteristics, of those holdings.

In Section 5, we discuss the relation between fair value measurement and macroeconomic effects. Because fair value measurement was asserted to contribute to systemic risk in the liquidity and credit crisis that began in 2007–2008, we focus on this aspect of the macro-economy. However, we believe that much of this discussion is applicable to other economic attributes that might be linked to fair value measurements, for example, information asymmetry. The notion that fair value measurement increases systemic risk is relatively new and is mainly the product of analytical models that use stylized settings and restrictive assumptions, combined with anecdotes included in accounting research papers and commentaries.

With regard to empirical evidence on this issue, and despite some commentators’ belief that accounting measurement, specifically measuring certain financial assets at fair value, contributed to the 2008 economic crisis, to date no published empirical research documents a clear causal relation between the fair value measurement attribute and systemic risk. Instead, research suggests that holdings of certain financial instruments, business models, and regulatory practices have a first-order effect on systemic risk. Accounting may have second-order effects, but research suggests that these primarily are the result of delayed loss recognition on financial assets measured at amortized cost subject to impairment and gains trading involving assets measured at amortized cost, for purposes of income recognition. Finally, we address the claim that accounting standards have resulted in financial statements becoming significantly more fair-value-oriented during the twenty years subsequent to issuance of Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 107 (SFAS 107), “Disclosures about Fair Value of Financial Instruments” (FASB, 1991, codified in FASB ASC Topic 825).
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