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ABSTRACT

The widespread adoption of financial accounting databases requires examination of their role and potential within corporate management information systems. Decision support systems currently use externally generated information. The substantial increase in the usage of acquirable data structures brings us to the discussion of key MIS questions: (1) increased exposure due to acquisition of foreign data, (2) integration of foreign data structures into corporate MISs, (3) costs and needs, (4) potentials and liabilities, and (5) database updates and reliability.

The integration of financial accounting databases into corporate information systems brings a new design dimension that must be considered and analyzed. This paper discusses these issues in light of the features and comparisons performed by two financial accounting databases—The Value Line and COMPSTAT databases.
THE INTEGRATION OF FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING DATABASES INTO A MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

I. INTRODUCTION

The increased usage of financial accounting databases (FADs) requires examination of its role and potential within corporate management information systems. Traditional emphasis in management information system (MIS) studies has been focused on information and decision support, using corporate generated and supplied information. Currently decision support systems (DSS) are beginning to use externally generated information (Gerrity\(^1\), 1971).

The integration of financial accounting databases (DBs) into corporate information systems brings in a new design dimension that must be considered and analyzed. This paper discusses these issues in light of features and comparisons performed between two

\---------------------
\(^1\) Gerrity's decision support system linked portfolio information with market information (provided by outside sources) to support investment trust officers. The paper focuses discussions upon DSS features and little is indicated concerning stock prices and information databases.
financial accounting databases—The Value Line and COMPSTAT databases\(^2\). These two databases are ranked as two of the most widely used databases by financial professionals (Makin, 1984).

Current usages of acquirable data structures (ADSs) includes: portfolio management and brokerage services (security price and accounting data), airline reservations by travel agents (access to online reservation systems and schedules), analytical reviews by auditors (financial accounting databases), and acquisition and financial analysis by large corporations (financial accounting databases).

The substantial increase in the usage of acquirable data structures brings us to the discussion of key MIS questions: (1) increased exposure due to acquisition of foreign data, (2) integration of foreign data structures into corporate MISs, (3) costs and needs, (4) potentials and liabilities, and (5) database updates and reliability. Due to the increasing popularity of information sources\(^3\) such as NAARS and others, this paper focus particular emphasis on financial accounting databases.

---

\(^2\)The Value Line Data Base is distributed by Value Line Data Services of Arnold Bernhard & Co., Inc., New York. The COMPSTAT database is distributed by Standard & Poor's Compustat Services, Inc.

\(^3\)Among these we find NAARS distributed by AICPA and Dow Jones News/Retrieval Service & Stock Quote Reporter maintained by Dow Jones & Company.
II. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING DATABASES

Financial Accounting Databases (FADs) are defined as acquirable data structures that contain information on accounting and security price data for a large number of corporations. Among the most popular we find:

a. VALUE LINE DATABASE
b. COMPUSTAT
c. Dow Jones News/Retrieval
d. CRSP

e. NAARS

These are typically supplied as either an online information service, oriented towards the terminal based query, or as a periodically updated tape for archival type of usage. Figure 1 displays a summary view of the corporate MIS incorporating FADs as an integral part of their structure.

Figure 1 also indicates the increased exposure for a corporate MIS that results from the usage of acquired data. The

-------------

4 See Williams et al. (1985) for a more complete list of online financial accounting databases.

5 The CRSP tape is maintained by The Center for Research in Security Prices, University of Chicago.

6 The National Automated accounting Research System (NAARS) is maintained by American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, National Automated Accounting Research System.
purchase of "mailing lists" and other types of archival data has long been a part of corporate life. The incorporation of these systems into day to day operations and strategic decisions based on this data substantially increase exposure risks. Other types of issues however are more visible and are deal with here.

[Figure 1 here]

(A) Technical Issues

FADs came into being primarily due to the economic circumstances of data gathering. Most corporations would probably not be able to afford the costs of gathering publicly available data on their competition with other companies. On the other hand the collection and supply of this data obviously benefited from economies of scale. Some of these databases were clearly the outcome of internal corporate needs (Value Line databases came into being due to the needs of the Value Line Investment Survey and then became a product on its own) while others were developed from clear research needs (e.g. the CRSP tapes) and slowly sank into the meanders of corporate usage. This hybrid origination brings out certain issues to be discussed:

1. The data in a FAD is not necessarily the data that a corporation would have chosen to gather. Most often, it has a substantial amount of useless information and also, does not
contain some information that may be available but was not coded. In consequence, we can observe the increasing usage of multiple, merged databases in research and in industry. These merges increase the risk of losing potentially useful data due to definitional and other types of problems.

2. FADs tend to have fixed record size sequentially based information with data added year after year presenting high percentages of missing values in the early years. This limits the feasibility of time series forecasting models based on early data. In addition, sequential files do not provide the flexibility needed to classify and analyze according to alternative concepts (different from the original key). It also makes it difficult to integrate FADs with internal databases.

3. Online databases, on the other hand, present a different set of problems. NAARS, which contains substantial parts of the text of more than 4,000 financial statements per year, is queried through NAARS/LEXIS terminals which are supplied by Mead Data (the source for NAARS) and limited by key query words and categories. Users must use a NAARS terminal leading to major limitations on the integration of its content into a corporate MIS.

The trend for online databases involves increasing the availability and facilitation of user interface. This would be accomplished by allowing microcomputers and other systems to interface to the base and capture data and/or execute users'
generated data. Benjamin (1982) identifies key trends for MIS and DP during the next decade:

- decreased terminal costs
- decreased communication costs

This mode of operation, however, creates a series of MIS design problems.

a. Security – if the MIS is fully interfaced (with automatic update) with a foreign source it abdicates its data screening prerogatives.

b. Costs – online databases searches, when in a foreign environment are typically extremely costly and present very steep learning costs leading to very high "usage initiation fees" even if these are not explicit costs.

c. Definitional Differences – a recent study (Vasarhelyi and Yang, 1985) compared the data content of two popular FADs (The Value Line and Compustat Databases) and found about 1,400 comparisons effected yearly over a period of eleven years (see Figure 2). The high percentage rate of discrepancies basically reflects the inherent difficulty of classifying data into pre-set categories that are consistent over time and across industries. A brief examination of the explanation of these discrepancies is shown in Figure 3.
Data in Figure 2 illustrates the scarcity of comparable information in the early years of data, as well as some degree of increased comparability in the latest years. It is noteworthy to observe the consistency of the discrepancy rates among the two databases. A more detailed view of the discrepancies is shown in Figure 3 for 1981. It can be observed that substantial explanation of the differences are due to between-industry coding differences while the estimated actual error rates are small (in the 1%-3% range).

(Figure 3 here)

(B) MIS Design Issues

FADs has been used in formal organizational systems either on a production function or most likely as a source of analytical reference. Production aid organizations may prepare, for example, investment newsletters based on the data from the database and distribute it as a paid service or an internal investment advice sheet. This usage poses interesting legal problems on the propriety of distributing data purchased from a different source. These will have policies concerning this secondary distribution. Other production type services may routinely prepare early warning reports on potential problem firms among the bank's client's (calculation of ratios), analytic
data on the competition, etc.

Analytical reference, on the other hand, is more ad hoc and potentially difficult to predict. Recent developments in the DSS area provide general guidelines which can help in the design of these applications. In particular, design should focus on (Alavi, 1982):

- flexibility to handle varied situations
- ease of usage
- responsiveness/flexibility to users' needs
- users' friendliness

As an example, corporations will defend or plan takeovers based on theoretical "consolidation" models which merge two companies and allow for the insertion of "what if" type of actions by the protagonists. Often the best data available on potential acquirees comes from FADs. NAARS data will be used to search for particular accounting disclosures that may be required in the course of a particular fiscal year. CRSP data may be used to test alternative portfolio strategies by investors.

All of these uses lead to a series of questions that must be responded to by users/potential users and suppliers of FADs:

1. Expected applications for the FADs
2. Expected frequency of usage
3. Needs of timely access, in particular on-line retrieval of data
4. Needs of data retroactivity
5. Needs of data interface with other data and other systems
6. Nature of user and his access needs
7. Needs for data update  
8. Needs of user friendliness  
9. Training and background needed  
10. Security and data access needs

Two anecdotes may serve to illustrate the needs and parameters of choice in different situations.

A small company acquired an Apple II computer for its mailing list and newsletter word processing needs. This company basically sells consulting and information services to a special industry with about 40 major companies. A consultant called their attention to the fact that they were collecting large amounts of financial accounting information on these companies that was already available in FADs and incurring substantial costs. Their needs were simple: financial accounting information had to be supplied in a consistent format, on a timely basis prior to the newsletter deadlines, after the annual reports and quarterly announcements. They had no need for online access or frequent usage. Their solution encompassed using the Apple II as a data transfer terminal out of a time-sharing service that contained a popular database. Negotiations with the database supplier resolved the data privacy issue as most of the newsletter subscribers were also subscribers of the database.

A large western based conglomerate is often involved in the acquisition of other organizations. These conglomerates are often privately held and must have their data verified against industry standards for the assessment of its quality and the
desirability of the acquisition. These acquisition screening meetings are surrounded with secrecy requiring the minimum possible number of people to be involved, excluding systems and financial analysis people. In one incidence, they purchased the usage of a FAD and using its data created preferential models for typical company performance in different activities and at different sizes. These models serve as "benchmarks" to examine the potential health of an acquiree. In addition, while the data is standardized and entered for comparative analysis, it is also used to prepare a "pro forma consolidated" statement that captures acquisition terms and outputs a sector based merger "result". The system is conversational and rather rigid in features but captures updated industry standards from a often update FAD and allows computer neophytes (as the financial vice president) to operate it and try different acquisition strategies. A fully interactive and flexible acquisition analysis system has been proposed and is being considered for development.
III. CONCLUSIONS

Financial accounting databases (FADs) are increasingly being incorporated into corporate information systems—creating a new typical problem for the information system designers. FADs are typically based in sequential data structures and have built-in time-series inconsistencies. In the future databases with substantial improved query features are going to be made available by vendors. These will bring with them problems of access limitations, lack of tailorization and considerable access exposure.

There is a real need for research into accounting information databases, in particular, FADs. A survey is needed to determine what is available, where and what it does contain and for how much it can be obtained. Surveys are also needed to establish the frequency, intensity and purpose of the use of FADs within MISs. Field studies are needed to experiment with potential state-of-the art uses of FADs. Laboratory studies could be performed to examine human interface with data rich systems and way of expert query into these large knowledge bases.
FIGURE 1
FADs in MIS

** Modified from Emery's (1969) symbolic view of the corporate MIS.
* Data Base Management System
FIGURE 2

DISCREPANCIES IN THE COMPARISON OF SEVEN FIELDS OF
THE VALUE LINE AND COMPUSTAT DATABASES
1971 - 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR (NUMBER OF COMPANIES MATCHED)</th>
<th>ASSET %</th>
<th>SALES %</th>
<th>INBET %</th>
<th>INVNT %</th>
<th>DEPRE %</th>
<th>LIABL %</th>
<th>PLANT %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971 (96)</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 (101)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973 (1336)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1242)*</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974 (1454)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1356)*</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975 (1480)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1380)*</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 (1478)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1378)*</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977 (1486)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1386)*</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 (1476)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1376)*</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 (1496)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1395)*</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 (1514)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1413)*</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 (1431)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1380)*</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* companies having data items with missing values in both databases were excluded.
FIGURE 3

COMPARISON OF COMPUSTAT AND VALUE LINE DATABASES - 1981
BASED ON 200 COMPANIES
DISCREPANCIES SOURCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA ITEM</th>
<th>ASSET</th>
<th>SALES</th>
<th>INBET</th>
<th>INVNT</th>
<th>DEPRE</th>
<th>LIABL</th>
<th>PLANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF DISCREPANCY</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCREPANCY RATE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAMPLE: 200 CO.

I. EXPLAINED DEFINITIONAL DIFFERENCES:
   A. DIFFERENT CURRENCY USED
   B. DIFFERENT INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION
      OR VARIABLE DEFINITIONAL DIFFERENCES
   
   A.  
      | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
      | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
   
   B.  
      | 0 | 20 | 7 | 60 | 23 | 14 |
      | 0 | 10 | 3.5 | 30 | 11.5 | 7 |

II. UNEXPLAINED DEFINITIONAL DIFFERENCES:
   NON-DISCLOSED CODING RULE DIFFERENCES
   OR CODING ERRORS
   BY
   
   COMPUSAT  
   | 0 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 69 | 1 | 12 |
   | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.5 | 34.5 | 0.5 | 6 |
   
   VALUE LINE  
   | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 2 | 7 |
   | 0 | 0.5 | 2 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 1 | 3.5 |
   
   BOTH  
   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 |
   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
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