



The Evolution of Fair Value Accounting and Its Impact on Financial Reporting Transparency: A Theoretical Review

Praveendas K^{1*}, Kaustubh Sharma², Ritu Alawa³, Hemant Mandloi⁴, Lalhunthara⁵, Dr. CA Mohit Bahal⁶

^{1*}Assistant Professor, Central University of Karnataka, Kalburagi, praveendask2@gmail.com

²Department of Finance and Accounting, Indian Institute of Management, Indore, 453556, Madhya Pradesh, India
kaustubhs@iimdr.ac.in

³Department of Humanities and Social Science, Indian Institute of Management, Indore, 453556, Madhya Pradesh, India
ritua@iimdr.ac.in

⁴Scholar, School of Social Science, Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya, Indore 452001, hmandloi.hm@gmail.com

⁵Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, Pachhunga University College, Aizawl, Mizoram, India,
lhtharanew@gmail.com

⁶Visiting Faculty, ICAI (The Institute of Chartered Accountants of India), Prayagraj Branch, camohitbahal@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This review examines the conceptual developments and the larger framework's useful implications of fair value accounting of transparency of reporting on finances. Based on a large amount of theoretical and empirical literature, the review explores the principles underlying fair value assessment and compares it with historical cost accounting, and discusses its applicability in the context of agency theory, theory of decision-usefulness, and the efficient market hypothesis. The evolution of fair value accounting is traced back to the early paradigms, to the major regulatory developments, such as international standard-setting efforts, and the reaction to the world financial crisis. The review also assesses its acceptance in the public and private spheres, with the emphasis on the contribution of international frameworks like the "International Financial Reporting Standards" and the "International Public Sector Accounting Standards". The main points that have been discussed are the advantages of greater relevance, comparability, and timeliness of financial reports and the problems of estimation uncertainty, auditability, and creative accounting. Also, the paper examines how governance, legal systems, and digital technologies, like blockchain, artificial intelligence, and sustainability reporting, affect the use of fair value accounting. This review ends with a synthesis of research gaps and suggests future directions that require more behavioral, cross-national, and normative research that places fair value accounting as an essential area of future academic and policy debate.

Keywords: Fair value accounting, Financial reporting, Transparency, Accounting theory, Digital transformation, Standard-setting

INTRODUCTION

Financial reporting is the basis of corporate transparency, investor decision-making, and regulatory oversight. It is an organized summary of the cash flows, performance, and financial status of an entity and is very important in alleviating asymmetry of information between the management and the stakeholders. Traditionally, historical cost accounting has served as the foundation for financial reporting, which is objective and verifiable, but in many cases does not capture current economic reality. The emergence of fair value accounting (FVA) in the changing environment of the global marketplace is due to the increased need for more relevant and timely financial information, as the latter attempts to measure assets and liabilities at their market-based values, instead of their historical cost (Ball, 2016). The concept of fair value accounting has become one of the most controversial aspects of financial reporting, especially because it emphasizes the inclusion of market-based information that makes the financial statements more relevant.

Standard-setters like the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) and the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) have been supportive of the adoption of fair value principles, especially through the IFRS 13, which gives a framework on how to measure the fair value of different financial instruments and non-financial items. The implementation of IFRS in the world has also led to an increase in fair value accounting practices (Ball et al., 2015). The trend is part of a wider trend of valuation techniques that focus more on investor relevance, comparability, and market responsiveness than the historic focus on conservatism and cost-based reliability.

There is no overstating the significance of transparency in financial reporting. Clear accounting systems promote trust in the financial markets, improve governance systems, and lead to stability in the financial systems (Acharya & Ryan, 2016). Transparency not only influences the behavior of investors, but it is also central in the regulatory processes that protect the efficiency of

the market. However, fair value accounting has had both positive and negative responses on the impact it has on transparency. It offers timely and market-consistent data on the one hand and introduces valuation subjectivity and volatility, particularly on assets and liabilities that do not trade in active liquid markets on the other hand. This uncertainty has caused a raging scholarly debate on whether FVA enhances or weakens transparency in practice. Fair value accounting also questions the auditors and the effectiveness of governance systems. As valuation techniques become more complex, auditors have no choice but to employ greater amounts of expert judgment and market modeling, which raises questions about the quality of audits and the reliability of assurance (Alharasis et al., 2020). The history of FVA also shows a pattern of regulatory adjustment such that standard-setters change their positions in response to financial crises, such as the 2008 global financial meltdown. These reactions have helped to argue that there is a need to reconcile the importance of measurement and the dependability of reporting. Financial reporting standards, including the fair value requirements, are formulated and interpreted under a specific legal, cultural, and institutional environment in terms of governance. The policies on reporting are frequently cross-jurisdictional, which introduces a risk of compliance and implementation gaps, often due to a difference in the regulatory environment and organizational capacity (Al-Tarawneh et al., 2024). Besides, the quality of governance directly influences the degree of openness in reporting and auditing financial information. The poor governance systems can encourage manipulation by using aggressive fair value estimates, which defeats the purpose of transparency that FVA is supposed to facilitate (Akpanuko & Umoren, 2018).

The corporate governance literature emphasizes how financial reporting is viewed as a means of resolving agency issues. Relevant, timely, and credible financial information aligns the managerial actions, which enhances boards' and stakeholders' capacity to monitor the interests of shareholders (Armstrong et al., 2015). Here, fair value reporting is not just a technical change in accounting, but it becomes a governance instrument that helps in protecting investors and market discipline. Nonetheless, such a system can only be successful when there is institutional preparedness, professional ability, and the establishment of consistent audit and regulatory practices. Considering the increasing complexity and

theoretical controversy of fair value accounting, the objective of this review is to synthesize and assess the development of FVA and its effects on the transparency of financial reporting. It will continue to concentrate on conceptual models, empirical evidence, historical development, and practical issues, and incorporate theoretical knowledge applicable to standard-setting and governance.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To determine how fair value accounting evolved conceptually and historically, as well as how it was incorporated into contemporary financial reporting practices.
2. To critically assess, from a theoretical standpoint, how fair value accounting affects financial report transparency.

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Definitions and Principles of Fair Value Accounting

Accounting for assets and liabilities at their present market value (as opposed to their historical cost of purchase) is known as fair value accounting, or FVA. The fundamental concept that underpins FVA is that financial statements should reflect real time economic situations and provide the users with relevant and timely information. Accounting rules define fair value as the price range at which an asset or obligation would be transferred or sold in a peaceful transaction among market participants on the measurement date, in particular IFRS 13 (De George et al., 2016). FVA is very dependent on the market-based inputs, degree of hierarchy (1-3), and valuation models that estimate the value in case of no active market (Chung et al., 2017).

Conceptual Comparison: Fair Value vs. Historical Cost

The change of historical cost accounting (HCA) to FVA is paradigmatic in financial measurement. Whereas HCA values liabilities and assets at the initial transaction value, FVA constantly revalues them by market forces. This difference has consequences on the relevance and verifiability of the information. The conceptual and practical distinctions between fair value and historical cost accounting are clarified by a comparative study of the two. These differences are summarized in Table 1 in major financial reporting aspects, including strengths and drawbacks.

Table 1. Key differences between FVA and HCA.

Feature	Fair Value Accounting	Historical Cost Accounting	Citation
Measurement Basis	Current market price	Original transaction cost	Barker et al. (2020)
Relevance	High	Moderate to low	De George et al. (2016)
Reliability	Subject to estimation errors	High (verifiable)	Barker et al. (2020)
Volatility in Statements	High	Low	Chung et al. (2017)
User Decision-Usefulness	Strong	Limited	Brusca et al. (2016); Chowdhury (2020)

While FVA enhances relevance, it often compromises reliability due to estimation uncertainty and judgment

calls. Conversely, HCA is more stable but may not reflect the current economic reality (Barker et al., 2020).

Theoretical Lenses

Agency Theory

According to agency theory, managers and shareholders have a principal-agent relationship, and financial reporting helps to lessen information asymmetry. FVA enhances the accountability of the agent to the principals since it reflects the current valuation of assets (De Villiers & Sharma, 2020). The flexibility in valuation can, however, be used to be opportunistic, and this may give more discretion to the managers.

Decision-Usefulness Theory

This theory holds that financial information must support users who are mostly investors in economic decision-making. The forward-looking and market-relevant information is given by fair value, and this is in line with the information requirements of capital providers (Chowdhury, 2020). FVA enhances financial reports' decision-usefulness by making them more comparable and responsive to the market events (Brusca et al., 2016).

Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH)

According to EMH, prices incorporate all the information. FVA helps in promoting this principle by using real-time data in financial statements. The fair value is well reflected, which allows markets to operate efficiently, provided that there are well-functioning and liquid markets (Bellucci et al., 2022).

The Relevance vs. Reliability Debate

The use of fair value accounting is usually surrounded by a debate that is critical: relevance versus reliability. Whereas relevance is concerned with the informational needs of the users, reliability is concerned with the verifiability and faithful presentation of the figures reported. The fair value is good at delivering relevant information that reflects the market situation, but is poor

in terms of reliability, particularly when the valuation inputs are managerial estimates (Barker et al., 2020). Critiques state that overdependence on Level 2 and 3 inputs compromises the objectivity of financial reporting (Chung et al., 2017). Nevertheless, the advocates emphasize that reliability is practically useless when it comes to making decisions unless it is relevant (De George et al., 2016).

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF FAIR VALUE ACCOUNTING

FVA did not come into existence out of the blue but developed over time as a reaction to the shortcomings of historical cost accounting and the dynamic needs of the global capital markets. It developed early in the latter half of the 20th century, with the expanding sophistication of financial instruments in the banking and capital-intensive sectors. The historical accounting paradigms that were based on prudence and verifiability were not able to reflect real-time market volatility and the economic reality of financial instruments. With the globalization of markets, real-time valuation became obvious, and the static, transaction-based reporting was replaced by more market-sensitive models (Gardi et al., 2021).

A number of regulatory milestones institutionalized the development. The IASB (International Accounting Standards Board) and the FASB (Financial Accounting Standards Board), which are headquartered in the U.S., were on the frontline to develop frameworks that included the fair value principles. The most important was the introduction of IFRS 13, which offered a uniform interpretation of fair value, a complete valuation hierarchy (Levels 1-3), and the use of market inputs. This norm increased the international comparability and reinforced transparency as a reporting goal (Fiechter & Novotny-Farkas, 2017). Table 2 summarizes the major regulatory trends in the institutionalization of FVA in the different jurisdictions of the world.

Table 2. Key Milestones in the Evolution of Fair Value Accounting

Year	Milestone	Regulatory Body	Citation
1993	Introduction of FAS 115 (marketable securities)	FASB	Gardi et al. (2021)
2001	Formation of the IASB and the convergence initiative	IASB	Fiechter & Novotny-Farkas (2017)
2006	Release of SFAS 157 on fair value measurement	FASB	Garcia-Perez et al. (2020)
2011	Issuance of IFRS 13 Fair Value Measurement	IASB	Dewi et al. (2019); Faccia et al. (2021)

The world financial crisis of 2008 had a very strong influence on the course of FVA. Fair value accounting was put under a lot of scrutiny during the crisis, with critics saying that marking assets to distressed market prices was a major contributor to financial instability. Financial institutions and banks were forced to recognize massive unrealized losses, which, although being sensitive to market conditions, were deemed by some to skew the prices of long-term assets (Fiechter & Novotny-Farkas, 2017). Both FASB and IASB reacted to this by updating their guidance and allowing greater discretion to be used when measuring fair value in illiquid markets. This placed the emphasis on the tension between transparency and stability of the financial system, a dilemma which

continues to influence standard-setting (Faccia et al., 2021). Meanwhile, the government began to embrace fair value by implementing International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS). The standards promote accrual accounting and have included fair value concepts, particularly when measuring the value of assets in infrastructure and property, plant and equipment (PPE) (Dewi et al., 2019). IPSAS framework suggests the institutionalization of FVA at a broader level than in the corporate world, and acknowledges that it can be applied to the field of public financial management and accountability.

The modern technological changes have also impacted on FVA. As the AI and data analytics continue to develop,

the valuation process is more and more supported by advanced modeling tools, making the estimates more accurate and consistent (De Villiers et al., 2024). The real-time data aggregation and decision-making, especially in large and knowledge-based organisations, have now been made possible with the help of knowledge management systems and integrated databases (Garcia-Perez et al., 2020).

In general, the development of FVA is predetermined by the changing market needs, regulatory changes, financial crisis, and technological advances. It is an indication of an ongoing trade-off between relevance, reliability, and feasibility in a fast-changing financial reporting environment.

FAIR VALUE ACCOUNTING AND FINANCIAL REPORTING TRANSPARENCY

Conceptual Clarity on Transparency in Financial Reporting

Financial reporting transparency is the availability and quality of financial reporting that fairly depicts an entity's performance and position. It incorporates the principles of openness, understandability, and truthfulness that enable the stakeholders to make sensible economic choices. Transparency as a concept in the framework of fair value accounting (FVA) is introduced as the capability to deliver current and decision-useful information that represents the market environment at the moment (Georgiou, 2018). Unlike historical cost models, where the changing value of assets and liabilities may be obscured, FVA tries to present an economically realistic view of the reporting entity.

Improvements in Relevance, Comparability, and Timeliness

FVA makes the financial statements more relevant because the current market information is used, and the numbers reported are more representative of the economic reality. It assists in comparability across companies and sectors, especially where international standards like IFRS 13 are used on a regular basis. In addition, by modifying numbers close to the reporting date, it improves the relevance of financial data (Habib & Jiang, 2015). Such features are especially crucial to capital markets, where real-time data is a vital input in

investment choices. Moreover, the disclosure of fair value at the right time contributes to investor confidence as well as to the decrease in the information asymmetry between corporate insiders and external users (Habib & Hasan, 2019).

Concerns Around Estimation Uncertainty and Auditability

Along with its advantages, FVA also comes with great challenges. Professional judgment, valuation models, and unobservable assumptions are used to estimate fair values, especially those that rely on Level 2 and Level 3 inputs. That creates uncertainty in estimation, which can undermine the reliability of reported values and transparency (Lachmann et al., 2015). Moreover, these subjectively obtained numbers have auditability issues since auditors have problems verifying the inputs and assumptions made by the management, particularly in cases where there are no active markets. Such issues are further escalated in the banking and technology industries, where intangible assets and financial instruments are often valued with the help of Level 3 models.

Mixed Empirical Evidence and Sectoral Variation

The empirical results of the effects of FVA on transparency are mixed in the real world. FVA enhances the informativeness of the earnings and the balance sheets in certain industries, including the finance and insurance industries. However, in other cases, e.g., regarding the public infrastructure and long-term asset management, the application of FVA can create volatility and perceived overstatement or understatement of the value (He et al., 2022). The study of the public sector also demonstrates that the quality and consistency of the fair value disclosures may be influenced by the political discretion and capacity limits (Heald & Hodges, 2015). In order to have a clearer picture of the complex effects of fair value accounting on the transparency of financial reporting, it would be helpful to examine its effects on the main reporting characteristics. Table 3 demonstrates the advantages and the disadvantages of FVA that are based on the empirical and theoretical experience of the recent literature.

Table 3. Effects of Fair Value Accounting on Reporting Transparency

Transparency Attribute	Positive Impact	Concerns/Limitations	Citation
Relevance	Reflects current market values	May overstate or understate during crises	Habib & Jiang (2015)
Comparability	Enables cross-firm consistency	Subject to the interpretation of valuation levels	Habib & Hasan (2019)
Timeliness	Values updated close to the reporting period	Market illiquidity delays valuation	Georgiou (2018)
Estimation Reliability	Useful under active market conditions	High uncertainty with Level 2 & 3 inputs	Lachmann et al. (2015)
Auditability	Strengthens when based on observable inputs	Weakens under subjective or unverifiable models	He et al. (2022); Heald & Hodges (2015)



In this section, it is established that although FVA is aimed at increasing financial transparency by increasing relevance and comparability, it also creates complexity and uncertainty that may water down its intended outcomes. The success of FVA in enhancing transparency thus depends on the market situation, the rigor of the audit, and the practices within the industry.

CONTEMPORARY DEBATES AND PRACTICAL CHALLENGES

Interpretation and Hierarchy of Fair Value Measurements

The fair value accounting (FVA) has a three-tier hierarchy that is meant to categorize the inputs that are utilized

when determining fair values as stipulated in IFRS 13. Level 1 inputs are the prices of the same assets quoted in active markets; Level 2 inputs are those that can be observed outside of listed prices, and Level 3 inputs are those that cannot be observed and must be estimated by management. Although this hierarchy is helpful in terms of structure and direction, it can also be problematic when it comes to interpretation, particularly when it comes to the timing of an input shifting between levels (Magnan et al., 2015). The main features of each level and their comparative contribution to the standard of financial reporting are summarized in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Fair Value Measurement Hierarchy: Characteristics and Implications

Level	Input Source	Measurement Reliability	Risk of Manipulation	Citation
Level 1	Quoted market prices (active markets)	High	Low	Magnan et al. (2015)
Level 2	Observable indirect inputs (e.g., yield curves)	Moderate	Moderate	Lev (2018)
Level 3	Unobservable inputs and internal models	Low	High	Maroun & Van Zijl (2016)

Disclosure Formats and Liability Valuation Issues

A practical difficulty associated with the implementation of FVA is with disclosure format and presentation. The way fair value information is disclosed (either directly on the financial statements' face or in the notes) can have a considerable effect on user interpretation. Specifically, the estimation of liabilities adds an extra complication. Fair value measurement of liabilities can include discounting future cash outflows based on current credit spreads, which may result in paradoxical results of a rise in credit risk that leads to an increase in reported financial performance (Lev, 2018). Liability disclosures also tend to be inconsistent in presentation across jurisdictions, which decreases their comparability and may send the wrong signal to analysts and stakeholders (Li & Yang, 2016). Users should therefore be keen to evaluate the context and assumptions that underlie such valuations to prevent misinterpretation.

Creative Accounting Risks and Transparency Erosion

Level 2 and Level 3 subjectivity inputs create an avenue to creative accounting, where the management can manipulate the inputs to get the desired financial results. This kind of conduct undermines the openness and integrity of financial statements (Lev, 2018). Practically, companies can make optimistic assumptions or can choose to apply valuation methods that overstate asset values or understate liabilities. Studies indicate that in a weak economy or when there is regulatory pressure, some companies have taken advantage of the flexibility of the fair value models to defer losses or manipulate earnings (Magnan et al., 2015). This brings about the question of the ethical aspects of FVA and the sufficiency of control mechanisms.

Political, Legal, and Governance Influences

The implementation of fair value is also exaggerated by political, legal, and institutional factors, especially in jurisdictions where the role of the government in the determination of accounting standards or where the regulatory regime is not enforced. Weaker legal protection or political influence of the countries may result in more unpredictable FVA enforcement that reduces the comparability and reliability of disclosures (Maroun & Van Zijl, 2016). In addition, there are governance and capacity constraints in the organizations in the public sector that adopt the fair value principles in frameworks like IPSAS. The preparation of the system, asset identification, and training are challenging and hinder the faithful execution of valuation principles (Manes-Rossi et al., 2020). Digital transformation has come with opportunities and complications. As an outcome of the modernization of financial reporting in technology platforms, data governance, systems interoperability, and automation of fair value models are becoming increasingly important (Lombardi & Secundo, 2021). Such developments, when not well managed, may inadvertently raise the measurement error or lower accountability. To sum up, fair value accounting is a developing tool of enhancing the quality of reporting, yet it is rife with interpretative, ethical, legal, and systemic problems that require critical attention by regulators, preparers, and auditors.

EMERGING THEMES AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES

Digital Transformation in Financial Reporting Systems

The ongoing digital revolution of financial reporting is changing the manner in which data is collected, processed, and reported. The manual systems are being replaced by automated and integrated reporting systems, which are more accurate, and the time lag in the financial disclosures is also reduced. The amendments also improve the real-time decision-making and the greater transparency of the principles of fair value accounting (FVA) usage as well (Paulinus et al., 2017). The digitization of reporting infrastructures allows the entities to simplify internal controls, use dynamic valuation models, and coordinate reporting across business units because it enhances consistency and traceability in fair value measurements (Parimi, 2018).

Blockchain, AI, and Big Data in Valuation and Audits

The use of technology, such as big data analytics, blockchain, and artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming how valuations and audits are performed in a significant way. Blockchain provides immutable ledgers that can be applied to prove the ownership of assets and the history of transactions in real-time, which enhances the confidence of the inputs that are employed to make fair value estimates (Morozova et al., 2020). In the meantime, AI-based valuation solutions allow processing large amounts of data without human interaction and increase the accuracy of the estimates and the need to make decisions by hand. Big data analytics is also useful in improving the quality of the audit as it allows auditors to detect anomalies in real-time and test fair value assumptions using large amounts of structured and unstructured data. Such technologies can also be used to create predictive models and this enhances future usefulness of financial statements.

Reporting of Digital and Intangible Assets

The traditional financial reporting systems have failed to capture the digital and intangible assets such as

intellectual property, data licenses, software, and algorithmic models. The fair value accounting offers a basis to bridge this gap through offering market-based valuations where possible (Menicucci & Paolucci, 2016). However, it remains that there are quite a number of intangible assets that lack active markets, and thus, it is quite difficult to give a credible valuation. High data and digital infrastructure companies, such as the tech and biotech sectors, face challenges in reporting the economic value of these assets in the conventional frameworks. Some of these issues can be solved with the help of FVA, but valuation techniques are not highly developed and often inconsistent (Morozova et al., 2020).

ESG and Sustainability Disclosures within Fair Value Frameworks

Sustainability disclosures' connection to environmental, social, and governance reporting and financial performance indicators is increasingly becoming intertwined. The fact that ESG factors are included in fair value models is a sign of the greater necessity of the overall responsibility of corporate reporting. However, the lack of standardized measures and a lack of consistency in regulatory guidance is an issue (Owen, 2015). In addition, the fair value of ESG-linked assets such as carbon credits, green bonds, and renewable energy installations must be implemented using new valuation methods that consider social and environmental aspects. FVA and ESG disclosures alignment is also more complex because of the interaction between financial materiality and social impact (Nobes & Stadler, 2015). In order to deliver the context for the changing use of fair value accounting, the emerging technological and reporting themes are summarized below. Table 5 describes how the fair value frameworks are being transformed with the help of innovations like digital transformation, blockchain, and ESG reporting.

Table 5. Technological and Reporting Themes in Fair Value Accounting

Theme	Key Contribution to FVA	Citation
Digital Transformation	Automation, real-time data flow	Paulinus et al. (2017); Parimi (2018)
Blockchain and AI	Reliable input verification, predictive models	Morozova et al. (2020)
Digital & Intangible Asset Valuation	Economic reflection of knowledge-based capital	Menicucci & Paolucci (2016)
ESG and Sustainability Disclosures	Integrated reporting of social-environmental value	Owen (2015); Nobes & Stadler (2015)

These changing dimensions are reshaping the scope and use of fair value accounting, which requires expanded frameworks that are in line with technology, intangible asset economics, and ESG accountability. Although promising, these innovations still need additional standardization, alignment with regulations, and methodological improvement to achieve their potential in the way they can contribute to transparency and relevance.

COMPARATIVE AND SECTORAL PERSPECTIVES IFRS vs. GAAP Treatment of Fair Value

The IFRS and the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) differ greatly in the interpretation and

implementation of fair value accounting (FVA). Under IFRS, particularly after IFRS 13, there is a market-based measurement model where liabilities and assets are assessed. At observable inputs as far as possible. Although the use of fair value under GAAP (e.g., SFAS 157) is also prescriptive and restrictive, it is more prescriptive and restrictive than under IFRS, and prefers historical cost when it is appropriate (Pelger, 2016). This disparity has international comparability and makes cross-border financial analysis difficult.

Country-Level Variation in Application and Compliance

The IFRS Foundation has been trying to harmonize fair value practices globally, but there is no uniformity in the application of fair value principles in different countries. As an example, developing economies usually do not have deep and liquid markets to provide reliable fair value estimation, which results in different interpretations and compliance rates (PHORNAPHATRACHAKORN & NA KALASINDHU, 2021). The differences are also compounded by differences in the enforcement of regulations, audit ability, and cultural tendencies to be conservative or transparent.

Public vs. Private Sector Reporting Experiences

The experience of the public sector with fair value accounting has developed within the framework of the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS). Nevertheless, implementation barriers have been created by practical limitations like the lack of valuation skills, inflexible budget systems, and political oversight. In the meantime, the private sector, particularly large corporations, has adopted fair value due to its decision-usefulness and benefits in communicating with investors (Preuss & Konigsgruber, 2021). The demand of investors in real-time valuation is usually more responsive to the private entities, especially those that are involved in capital markets, but the budgetary control and stewardship are more important to the public institutions.

Sector-Specific Insights: Banking, SMEs, and Fintech

Depending on the industry, fair value accounting can have quite varied effects. An example is the sector that deals with banking and financial services, where the market volatility and regulatory capital requirements are very high, and the use of fair value is both advantageous and risky. Level 2 and 3 inputs are frequently used by banks, and they may conceal the actual economic risks in case of market decline (Rathke et al., 2016). The challenges affecting Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) are unique since most of them do not have the internal capacity or exposure in the market to implement fair value. In the case of these firms, compliance may be expensive and cause estimation uncertainty (Saleh et al., 2022). Conversely, fintech companies have proven innovative while determining digital assets' fair value and blockchain-based instruments that are often in regulatory unknowns (Roszkowska, 2021). Accounting regimes and industries have different interpretations, and using fair value accounting because of the diversity in the institutional and regulatory environment. These differences are presented in Table 6 in a comparative overview, indicating the most significant dimensions influencing the outcomes of implementation and transparency.

Table 6. Comparative Aspects of Fair Value Accounting Across Contexts

Dimension	IFRS	GAAP	Public Sector	Private Sector
Approach	Market-based, principle-oriented	Rules-based, conservative	Stewardship-driven (IPSAS)	Investor-focused
Implementation Complexity	Moderate	High (more prescriptive)	High (valuation and legal issues)	Moderate to High
Transparency Outcome	High with active markets	Moderate to high	Mixed (subject to political influence)	High (especially in listed firms)

This section reveals that fair value accounting treatment and effect are not homogeneous. Institutional maturity, sectoral needs, and regulatory conditions translate FVA principles into practice. Thus, one should be quite careful in assessing its efficiency in different fields.

SYNTHESIS AND THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Integration of Theoretical and Empirical Literature

Fair value accounting (FVA) has been termed as a phenomenon that has been characterized by a continuous interplay between the theoretical and empirical backing. Theoretical contributions: Agency theory, stakeholder theory, and institutional theory can be used to view the transparency and valuation objectives of FVA. As an example, Tassadaq and Malik (2015) consider how far innovative accounting practices are limited or boosted under FVA due to the agency conflicts. Empirically, Zamora-Ramirez and Morales-Diaz (2018) indicate the level of international literature that assesses the practical implications of implementing FVA, which has been indecisive in regards to the materiality, volatility, and

comparability of the financial statements. A blend of these strands gives a broader picture of the good and bad aspects of FVA regimes.

Implications for Accounting Standard-Setting

One of the most significant contributions of the FVA literature is the need to inform the accounting standard-setting organizations such as the IASB and FASB. Verifiability and dependability are also very problematic when the uncertainty is used in the fair value measurement, especially at Level 3 of fair value hierarchy. Schmidhuber et al. (2022) emphasize that in the case of the public sector standards (IPSAS), the balance between the technical power and the feasibility of application should be reached. Zyla (2020) also goes further to provide implementation recommendations and urge the adoption of standard fair value measuring regimes which not only overcome the deficiencies of liquidity and disclosure. These publications observe that the standard setters have to make a decision between conceptual correctness and operational effectiveness.

Contributions to the Literature on Transparency and Valuation

The argument of whether FVA enhances or corrupts transparency still holds the academic and professional space. Unerman et al. (2018) offer a larger scope of the way the accounting systems have to be changed to consider the externalities and non-financial effects, which is a trending concept in the context of integrated and sustainability reporting. Susbiyani et al. (2023) add to it by exploring the Islamic social reporting and its effects on the valuation of companies and disclosure ethics, and

they also contribute to the debate on transparency in different cultural and ethical settings.

Framework Alignment and Policy Considerations

The fit of FVA frameworks to the wider regulatory, policy, and market contexts is a key area of concern. The policies should be such that FVA complements rather than substitutes for the content of the financial reporting. The key contributions to the literature and their implications for standard-setting and policy development are summarized in Table 7 below.

Table 7. Literature Contributions and Policy Implications for Fair Value Accounting

Study	Focus Area	Policy/Standard Implication
Tassadaq & Malik (2015)	Agency risks and creative accounting	Need for governance frameworks alongside FVA
Zamora-Ramírez & Morales-Díaz (2018)	Empirical literature synthesis	Evidence-based revisions in disclosure requirements
Schmidhuber et al. (2022)	Public sector reporting (IPSAS)	Tailored FVA guidance for governmental entities
Zyla (2020)	Practical application of FVA	Level hierarchy clarification and audit alignment
Unerman et al. (2018)	Externalities and integrated reporting	Incorporation of ESG and non-financial metrics in FVA
Susbiyani et al. (2023)	Islamic social reporting and valuation	Cultural and ethical adaptation of fair value practices

In summary, a convergence of theoretical foundations and empirical findings underscores the necessity for evolving FVA standards that are globally coherent, context-sensitive, and capable of enhancing both valuation accuracy and financial reporting transparency.

RESEARCH GAPS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Fair value accounting (FVA) has received significant academic interest, but still, there are still significant research gaps that require further investigation. A major gap is the behavioral aspects of FVA, i.e., the way in which auditors, preparers, and users of financial information interpret fair value disclosures when faced with uncertainty. Although the technical and regulatory implications have been well examined, the psychological and behavioral response to valuation subjectivity has not been well studied, especially in high volatility settings or crises. In the same way, specifically, the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) and the FVA in the public sector need more academic attention. The special budgetary, political control, and performance measurement requirements of public organizations demand special inquiries into the suitability and flexibility of FVA models in these spheres. Future research can also be conducted based on cross-national comparative studies. It is still necessary to comprehend how the quality of institutions, legal environments, and cultural values affect the perception, interpretation, and enforcement of norms of fair value in different jurisdictions. These studies might provide information about the best practices and local adaptations that are nevertheless consistent with the global convergence objectives. The other significant trend is the convergence of FVA with digital solutions and non-financial reporting,

including ESG measures, sustainability reporting, and intellectual capital. The next research should focus on how blockchain, AI-based valuation tools, and big data analytics may help or complicate fair value application. Lastly, it is imperative to create normative theories of valuation that balance decision-usefulness against ethical and social responsibility in order to steer regulators and researchers towards more accommodating and flexible accounting frameworks.

CONCLUSION

The history of fair value accounting (FVA) is among the crucial changes in the environment of contemporary financial reporting. Since its initial theoretical foundations and regulatory benchmarks, such as the implementation of IFRS 13, to its post-crisis adjustments and modern digital changes, FVA has progressively changed how financial assets and liabilities are measured, disclosed, and interpreted. It was created in response to historical cost accounting's shortcomings in an attempt to improve the timeliness and economic actuality of financial documentation. One of FVA's primary pledges is that it can raise accounting transparency. FVA has helped in enhanced comparability, relevance, and investor confidence by basing valuations on observable market inputs and regularly upgrading the assets' value. Simultaneously, it has brought a series of issues, especially when it comes to estimation uncertainty, auditability, and the danger of creative accounting. These issues are more pronounced in evaluations at Levels 2 and 3, where market inputs are more subjective. The practice has been accompanied by the development of theoretical discourse. The agency theory, decision-usefulness, and the efficient market hypothesis all offer insights into a

multidimensional perspective of the strengths and trade-offs of FVA. The review also demonstrates how the FVA story is constantly redefined by the use of both public and private sector applications, regulatory diversity, and digital integration. In the future, the applicability of FVA will depend on the adaptive ability, particularly in incorporating non-financial measures, maintaining credibility in complicated valuation contexts, and being compatible with the changing international standards. To both the scholar and the practitioner, this highlights a long-standing necessity of critical thinking, innovation, and empirical precision.

REFERENCES

1. Acharya, V. V., & Ryan, S. G. (2016). Banks' financial reporting and financial system stability. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 54(2), 277–340.
2. Akpanuko, E. E., & Umoren, N. J. (2018). The influence of creative accounting on the credibility of accounting reports. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*, 16(2), 292–310.
3. Alharasis, E. E., Prokofieva, M., Alqatamin, R. M., & Clark, C. (2020). Fair value accounting and implications for the auditing profession: Historical overview. *Accounting and Finance Research*, 9(3), 31–52.
4. Al-Tarawneh, A., Al-Badawi, M., & Hatab, W. A. (2024). Translating governance and legal compliance: Exploring the role of translation in facilitating corporate reporting and policy implementation. *Corporate Law & Governance Review*, 6(3).
5. Armstrong, C., Guay, W. R., Mehran, H., & Weber, J. (2015). The role of information and financial reporting in corporate governance: A review of the evidence and the implications for banking firms and the financial services industry. *Economic Policy Review*, Forthcoming.
6. Ball, R. (2016). IFRS–10 years later. *Accounting and Business Research*, 46(5), 545–571.
7. Ball, R., Li, X., & Shivakumar, L. (2015). Contractibility and transparency of financial statement information prepared under IFRS: Evidence from debt contracts around IFRS adoption. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 53(5), 915–963.
8. Barker, R., Penman, S., Linsmeier, T. J., & Cooper, S. (2020). Moving the conceptual framework forward: Accounting for uncertainty. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 37(1), 322–357.
9. Bellucci, M., Cesa Bianchi, D., & Manetti, G. (2022). Blockchain in accounting practice and research: Systematic literature review. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 30(7), 121–146.
10. Brusca, I., Gómez-Villegas, M., & Montesinos, V. (2016). Public financial management reforms: The role of IPSAS in Latin-America. *Public Administration and Development*, 36(1), 51–64.
11. Chowdhury, R. H. (2020). Accounting for data: A framework for valuing and reporting digital intangible assets. *Journal of Frontiers in Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(1), 16–23.
12. Chung, S. G., Goh, B. W., Ng, J., & Yong, K. O. (2017). Voluntary fair value disclosures beyond SFAS 157's three-level estimates. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 22, 430–468.
13. De George, E. T., Li, X., & Shivakumar, L. (2016). A review of the IFRS adoption literature. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 21, 898–1004.
14. De Villiers, C., & Sharma, U. (2020). A critical reflection on the future of financial, intellectual capital, sustainability and integrated reporting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 70, 101999.
15. De Villiers, C., Dimes, R., & Molinari, M. (2024). How will AI text generation and processing impact sustainability reporting? *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 15(1), 96–118.
16. Dewi, N., Azam, S., & Yusoff, S. O. U. T. H. (2019). Factors influencing the information quality of local government financial statement and financial accountability. *Management Science Letters*, 9(9), 1373–1384.
17. Faccia, A., Manni, F., & Capitanio, F. (2021). Mandatory ESG reporting and XBRL taxonomies combination: ESG ratings and income statement, a sustainable value-added disclosure. *Sustainability*, 13(16), 8876.
18. Fiechter, P., & Novotny-Farkas, Z. (2017). The impact of the institutional environment on the value relevance of fair values. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 22, 392–429.
19. Garcia-Perez, A., Ghio, A., Occhipinti, Z., & Verona, R. (2020). Knowledge management and intellectual capital in knowledge-based organisations: A review and theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(7), 1719–1754.
20. Gardi, B., Abdalla Hamza, P., Sabir, B. Y., Mahmood Aziz, H., Sorguli, S., Abdullah, N. N., & Al-Kake, F. (2021). Investigating the effects of financial accounting reports on managerial decision making in small and medium-sized enterprises. *SSRN Working Paper*.
21. Georgiou, O. (2018). The worth of fair value accounting: Dissonance between users and standard setters. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 35(3), 1297–1331.
22. Habib, A., & Hasan, M. M. (2019). Corporate life cycle research in accounting, finance and corporate governance: A survey, and directions for future research. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 61, 188–201.
23. Habib, A., & Jiang, H. (2015). Corporate governance and financial reporting quality in China: A survey of recent evidence. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, 24, 29–45.
24. He, R., Luo, L., Shamsuddin, A., & Tang, Q. (2022). Corporate carbon accounting: A literature review of carbon accounting research from the Kyoto Protocol to the Paris Agreement. *Accounting & Finance*, 62(1), 261–298.

25. Heald, D., & Hodges, R. (2015). Will “austerity” be a critical juncture in European public sector financial reporting? *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 28(6), 993–1015.
26. Lachmann, M., Stefani, U., & Wöhrmann, A. (2015). Fair value accounting for liabilities: Presentation format of credit risk changes and individual information processing. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 41, 21–38.
27. Lev, B. (2018). The deteriorating usefulness of financial report information and how to reverse it. *Accounting and Business Research*, 48(5), 465–493.
28. Li, X., & Yang, H. I. (2016). Mandatory financial reporting and voluntary disclosure: The effect of mandatory IFRS adoption on management forecasts. *The Accounting Review*, 91(3), 933–953.
29. Lombardi, R., & Secundo, G. (2021). The digital transformation of corporate reporting – a systematic literature review and avenues for future research. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 29(5), 1179–1208.
30. Magnan, M., Menini, A., & Parbonetti, A. (2015). Fair value accounting: Information or confusion for financial markets? *Review of Accounting Studies*, 20, 559–591.
31. Manes-Rossi, F., Nicolò, G., & Argento, D. (2020). Non-financial reporting formats in public sector organizations: A structured literature review. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 32(4), 639–669.
32. Maroun, W., & Van Zijl, W. (2016). Isomorphism and resistance in implementing IFRS 10 and IFRS 12. *The British Accounting Review*, 48(2), 220–235.
33. Menicucci, E., & Paolucci, G. (2016). Fair value accounting and the financial crisis: A literature-based analysis. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*, 14(1), 49–71.
34. Morozova, T., Akhmadeev, R., Lehoux, L., Yumashev, A. V., Meshkova, G. V., & Lukyanova, M. (2020). Crypto asset assessment models in financial reporting content typologies. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 7(3), 2196.
35. Nobes, C. W., & Stadler, C. (2015). The qualitative characteristics of financial information, and managers’ accounting decisions: Evidence from IFRS policy changes. *Accounting and Business Research*, 45(5), 572–591.
36. Owen, G. (2015). Integrated reporting: A review of developments and their implications for the accounting curriculum. In *Sustainability in Accounting Education* (pp. 43–59).
37. Parimi, S. S. (2018). Optimizing financial reporting and compliance in SAP with machine learning techniques. *SSRN Working Paper*.
38. Paulinus, E. C., Oluchukwu, N., & Somtochukwu, O. (2017). Empirical investigation of corporate governance and financial reporting quality of quoted companies in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 1(5), 117–137.
39. Pelger, C. (2016). Practices of standard-setting—An analysis of the IASB’s and FASB’s process of identifying the objective of financial reporting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 50, 51–73.
40. PHORNLAPHATRACHAKORN, K., & NA KALASINDHU, K. (2021). Digital accounting, financial reporting quality and digital transformation: Evidence from Thai listed firms. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(8), 409–419.
41. Preuss, S., & Königsgruber, R. (2021). How do corporate political connections influence financial reporting? A synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 40(1), 106802.
42. Rathke, A. A. T., Santana, V. D. F., Lourenço, I. M. E. C., & Dalmácio, F. Z. (2016). International financial reporting standards and earnings management in Latin America. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 20, 368–388.
43. Roszkowska, P. (2021). Fintech in financial reporting and audit for fraud prevention and safeguarding equity investments. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, 17(2), 164–196.
44. Saleh, I., Marei, Y., Ayoush, M., & Afifa, M. M. A. (2022). Big data analytics and financial reporting quality: Qualitative evidence from Canada. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*, 21(1), 83–104.
45. Schmidhuber, L., Hilgers, D., & Hofmann, S. (2022). International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSASs): A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 38(1), 119–142.
46. Susbiyani, A., Halim, M., & Animah, A. (2023). Determinants of Islamic social reporting disclosure and its effect on firm’s value. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, 14(3), 416–435.
47. Tassadaq, F., & Malik, Q. A. (2015). Creative accounting & financial reporting: Model development & empirical testing. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 5(2), 544–551.
48. Unerman, J., Bebbington, J., & O’dwyer, B. (2018). Corporate reporting and accounting for externalities. *Accounting and Business Research*, 48(5), 497–522.
49. Zamora-Ramírez, C., & Morales-Díaz, J. (2018). The use of fair value measurement in financial reporting: A literature review. *Studies of Applied Economics*, 36(2), 489–514.
50. Zyla, M. L. (2020). *Fair value measurement: Practical guidance and implementation* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.