

# Problems in Implementing Theoretical Concepts in Practical Accounting

Ping Zhou<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Accountancy, Central University of Finance and Economics, Beijing, China.100098*

*\*Corresponding author. Email: 2018210658@email.cufe.edu.cn*

## ABSTRACT

Accounting sector experiences technicalities in data-keeping and retrieving due to the changing technology. As a result, accountants have to remain updated on the new technological practices adopted to enable effectiveness and efficiency in the industry. For this reason, accountants may face challenges in implementing theoretical concepts by either adopting outdated theories or conflicting theories in practical accounting. Thus, the study investigates the possible problems accountants experience in their daily accounting activities. In this way, the study explores problems associated with theoretical concepts like adopting outdated theories and conflicting theories in actual practice. The study furthers investigation on the contemporary and future implications of adopting outdated and inconsistent approaches and correlated impacts in the entire accounting practice. Nonetheless, the paper makes predictions for future development and suggestions on possible issues. The study uses the findings and analysis of verifiable literature, searched with keywords like accounting theories, accounting practice, accounting management, intervention theories, and bridging theories and practice. Consequently, the study revealed that the dynamic contexts of the contemporary accounting paradigm require accountants to remain vigilant on the emerging technology, especially in the incorporation of the emergent technological systems into the practical accounting practice. Besides, accountants must analyze the type of theory used in actual practice. Some accounting theories might be outdated to the current system or inconsistent with the understanding founded by the primary ideas. Most of the iconic disclaimers vigilant to incorporating the accounting theories into the practical practice include consistency with measurability, future assessment, historical costs, estimates, changing accounting policies, verifiability, errors, and frauds.

**Keywords:** *Accounting Theories, Accounting Practice, Accounting Management, Intervention Theories, and Bridging Theories and Practice*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The world's socio-economic and political practices have been dynamically changing over the recent past. Some scholars [1] attach the phenomenon to the rapidly advancing technology that yields new techniques and strategies in the various sectors. Consequently, accountants find it difficult to implement most accounting theories into practice. The accountants are thus kept on toes to keep watch of any new accounting practice emerging in the dynamic economy. Besides, the accounting sector experiences technicalities in data-keeping and retrieving due to the changing technology. As a result, accountants have to remain updated on the new technological practices adopted to enable effectiveness and efficiency in the industry. For this reason, accountants may face challenges in implementing

theoretical concepts by either adopting outdated theories or conflicting theories in practical accounting. Thus, the study investigates the possible problems accountants experiences in their daily accounting activities. In this way, the study explores problems associated with theoretical concepts like adopting outdated theories and conflicting theories in actual practice. The study furthers investigation on the contemporary and future implications of adopting outdated and inconsistent approaches and correlated impacts in the entire accounting practice. Nonetheless, making predictions for future development and suggestions on possible issues.

## 2. THE OUTDATED THEORIES

A few speculations are obsolete and along these lines might require transformation as for present-day techniques. In any case, that will require time and

exertion [2]. As an accountant, it is more straightforward for you to foster training on the situation around you instead of creating a hypothesis that may not be useful [3]. Some speculations come up short on the comprehension of the social part of the business and our current circumstance that has changed extra time. You, as a bookkeeper, might see a ton of changes from bygone eras[4]. The theoretical ideas are not worried about passing judgment on the reasonableness of the result of bookkeeping practice; all things being equal, it centres after passing judgment on the channels of control of contribution to the outcome. Theories and ideas give need to cash as opposed to timing[5]. This is a grave error as the worth of cash differs concerning time continuously[6]. The hypotheses are not fully informed regarding the method of bookkeeping. You, as a bookkeeper, probably saw that before, there was a ton of mystery related to the technique just as records of bookkeeping, presently it is genuinely challenging to keep up with that mystery with everybody, so your organization knows typically all that you do as well[2]. You as a bookkeeper should realize that the laws and guidelines are not equivalent to well; things are changing regarding connection with different nations or the economy of the world.

### 3. THE CONFLICTING THEORIES

#### 3.1 Theories and Concepts set by rigid logic

There is a minor issue that a few hypotheses struggle with one another. Accountants can confound which to follow (rigid logic) and keep away from the struggle[7]. In this manner, you might try not to utilize theoretical ideas completely. The hypotheses and theories are set by unbending rationale. Along these lines, there isn't a lot of space to breathe for a change [7]. Regardless of whether you conclude, it would help transform yourself to think about many things. It is a troublesome strategy without any assurance of success [7]. There are various types of speculations; some are logical, some are dependent on standards[7]. You as a bookkeeper should realize that these rational methodologies are not easy to comprehend, and they are additionally hard to work. Specific escape clauses in their suppositions, recommendations, and proposals can be taken advantage of[7]. It can subsequently lead to deceiving ends and, along these lines, cause issues for your association [7]. It may be because of individual inclination and can be controlled by various gatherings of interest. Thus, hurting the organization.

#### 3.2 Theories and Concepts set by Situational Conflicts

The theoretical ideas can adjust with the change in situations of world-changing occasions, for instance, Coronavirus[8]. The speculations are not fully informed regarding the current bookkeeping situation, and in this

way, you as a bookkeeper may not see any utilization to these hypotheses. Intelligent people detailed them cautiously when the innovation was not comparable to ours [8]. Subsequently, you ought not to neglect them. In this way, we should remember that these hypotheses should have significant worth as they assisted the bookkeepers to keep up with records with fewer assets; they should have some innovative advancements[8]. You can allude to the Accounting Doctor for all the more such articles.

#### 3.3 Theories and Concepts based on principles

Attempting to depict social hypothesis' pertinence to bookkeeping incite reactions of gloom. A typical response expresses that bookkeeping has no theory[8]. This has an establishment, aside from the people who contend that twofold section accounting is a hypothesis that bookkeeping does not have a tremendous hypothetical premise. It is regularly educated and rehearsed as strategies and frameworks made through experimentation and the experience and realism of professionals[8]. In any case, plans indeed lay on hypothesis, be it of circumstances and results or comprehension of what customers need or need. Given the shortfall of a specific bookkeeping hypothesis, one should go to other sociology disciplines to sort out rehearses[8]. This welcomes the answer that bookkeeping comprises valuable methods to determine monetary issues - consequently, the hypothesis is unimportant. This view is tragically broadly held, as an assessment of schedules for degrees and expert capabilities will uncover[8]. This brings up issues about the situation with bookkeeping information.

However, accounting theories are vital for understanding why, how, and how bookkeeping works. Without the underpinnings of a hypothesis, it is minimal other than people's astuteness or 'enchantment', which delivers its professes to establish a corpus of information justifying scholarly or proficient status sketchy[9]. The historical background of the hypothesis gets from 'truth': given bookkeeping tries to 'valid and reasonable' sees disregarding theory is hazardous. It is hard to plan compelling frameworks for guidelines, responsibility, navigation, or control without ideas[9]. For instance, early architects regularly over-repaid structures as designing science then, at that point, couldn't precisely compute loads ahead of time. The absence of a hypothesis raises similar issues for bookkeeping [9]. Another typical reaction is that social theory is redundant as the actual sciences work well for bookkeeping. Here the scientist is depicted as an impartial and segregated spectator of a level-headed and outer reality[9]. Information is made by recognizing key attributes of exact peculiarities, estimating them, and through measurable procedures testing whether guessed affiliations, at times in causal chains, exist[10]. The point

is to make a 'reality net' that mirrors reality and predicts results.

In this vein, a famous region in bookkeeping is trying business sector responses to bookkeeping declarations; however, it is utilized broadly elsewhere[10]. For instance, the possibility hypothesis attempts to interface sorts of controls to ecological variables, and others relate varieties in bookkeeping practices to public societies. An outrageous form of 'scientism' that rules a lot of bookkeeping research is the positive bookkeeping hypothesis [10]. This professes to be unmistakable, non-standardizing, and supported as its exact measurable investigations anticipate occasions. Leaving to the side cases by rationalists of science that this mistakenly reflects how much logical revelation happens. 'Logical' work inside bookkeeping has esteem[10]. Our anxiety is that it professes to be only the right and suitable means for hypothesizing bookkeeping neglects to perceive that 'scientism' is antiquity and can't convey the widespread realities it guarantees[10]. The outcome is a crippling disavowal of fascinating and vital elective request methods.

### ***3.4 Theories and Concepts based on Intellectual Predispositions***

The portrayal of nonpartisan disconnected analysts in specific bookkeeping hypotheses, as somewhere else, is a fantasy[11]. Individuals are dependent upon intellectual predispositions. Along these lines, what is evident, select for study, and decipher results is intervened by close to home and context-oriented elements[11]. Also, the truth is socially developed through connection with others or potentially through correspondence mediums like texts or the press. This brings about issues of force, belief systems, understanding and which means, and language. Cases to be simply illustrative are misleading[11]. What matters, ideas and qualities are contemplated should be picked. Such choices are blurred by interests, language, culture, and involved, regardless of unwittingly, regularizing decisions[11]. The hypothesis makes a few things noticeable, and possibly controllable yet renders different issues and gatherings imperceptible: it reflects specific understandings of the world and makes them.

Since bookkeeping calling has been allowed status and honors commenced on its professes to serve the public interest, this can't be disregarded[11]. For instance, many bookkeeping examinations and practice advances the monetary interests of financial backers but dismisses the general claim. It professes to be unbiased and elucidating. Its refusal of different request methods opens up charges that it supports business as usual and prevailing perspective at chances with that of representatives, clients, or everyday society[11]. Frequently it is expected that self-equilibrating monetary balances happen, oiled by bookkeeping information. This might have some quick legitimacy, yet it disregards

significant discontinuities originating from social struggles, financial emergencies, or innovative change[11]. Ultimately, the portrayal of human conduct is excessively deterministic: it is viewed as a reaction to outer powers or natural mental properties once in a while[11]. This keeps the potential from getting human organization and decisions.

A continuous grievance is that bookkeeping research utilizing social hypothesis is hard to comprehend, is coldhearted, and needs practical application[12]. Given the energy of social hypothesis applications to bookkeeping, its under-resourcing comparative with different roads of request, and its test to winning interests and approaches, it is evident that productive applications stay meagre[12]. Nonetheless, this need not be so. Worries about ordinary hypotheses have prodded some bookkeeping scientists, to a great extent from past the USA, to examine bookkeeping from the perspectives of social, at times essential, speculations[12]. This part traces the premise and accomplishments of work of this sort.

Imperatives of the room block a point by point and full article; the point is to lay its principle highlights as an introduction to more profound examination by the peruser[13]. Would it be advisable for them they so wish, which we want to believe that they will? Work has been placed into four classes depending on their apparent shared trait of focal topics and possible commitments. The attribution of various speculations to every type is without a doubt careless: it can't wholly address every hypothesis and its disparities, covers, accomplishments, and potential[13]. Notwithstanding, this detailing is presented as a heuristic gadget to help further arrangement and examination. The classifications are the miniature creation and understanding of bookkeeping, talks and text, the political economy, and institutional studies[13]. Each is inspected concerning their philosophy, epistemology; approach; and importance to facilitating economic change and strength. Few investigations inside every class are drawn upon to show these aspects and their pertinence to bookkeeping[13]. Where potential examinations by the creators are utilized not because they are awesome but because they are natural, we can follow their hidden presumptions, goals, and ends with more certainty. They are on administration bookkeeping to a great extent, yet the hypotheses explained apply to monetary bookkeeping.

## **4. DISCUSSION**

Therefore, the study above vividly implies that the basic creation and understanding incorporates ethnographic, grounded, structuration, and social investigations of science speculations. Scientists typically lead definite contextual analyses to determine how the structure, which means and work of bookkeeping frameworks and information, is inferred. Accountants

expect everyday reality from social collaborations with others. These might fluctuate across time, space and people. This conviction that individuals effectively develop the outside world difficulties traditional perspectives preceding and free of the entertainers in question. It has incited banters over how thoughts of a level-headed and emotional reality may be accommodated; for instance, some have gone to the structuration hypothesis of Giddens to determine. Several scientists have studied the humanism of science, particularly the entertainer network hypothesis, which is dubious to outline between levels of examination and the social and specialized. To distinguish how bookkeeping advances and practices arise as opposed to the over investigations' emphasis on close collaboration, post-present day and post-underlying different sub-societies and current correspondences, frequently connected with commercialization and the media, connect with bookkeeping.

The theories are dubious of cases that information can be particular and exudes from a solitary source; instead, it is viewed as relative, scattered, and pluralistic. Instead, they look to exhibit that any text, including bookkeeping reports and scholarly papers, has numerous understandings and depends on redundancies, self-referential rationale, and frequently confusing and problematic roundabout thinking. Their advantage isn't simply breaking down what is in the text but what it avoids. By rebelliously penetrating messages indicating to address reality. The hypothetical methodologies above are inductive; the hypothesis is based on the information, regardless of whether literary or given perceptions of social conduct. They will generally zero in on miniature rather than large-scale investigations. Interestingly, political economy and institutional hypothesis research are more rational, more leaned to look at occasions from a foreordained hypothetical position, and lay more important implications on large-scale investigations of primary elements. Much work inside the political economy gets from or is affected by Marxism, particularly variations from its traditional structure.

It attempts to uncover how political and financial foundations inside explicit societies and monetary frameworks interface with and repeat financial results, especially in conveying abundance and power. It scrutinizes the bookkeeping calling, relates bookkeeping estimation to the formation of excess worth, and how frameworks trying to separate exertion from work have changed because of contentions and emergencies because of work and capital contrasts. Neo-Marxist methodologies question old-style Marxism's economic and political determinism. All things being equal, more special consideration is paid to philosophy and culture and the unexpected idea of political results. In this vein, crafted by Bourdieu has drawn in much interest because monetary capital is considered close by friendly and social capital.

## 5. CONCLUSION

As described, the dynamic contexts of the contemporary accounting paradigm require accountants to remain vigilant on the emerging technology, especially in the incorporation of the emergent technological systems into the practical accounting practice. Besides, accountants must analyze the type of theory used in actual practice. Some accounting theories might be outdated to the current system or inconsistent with the understanding founded by the primary ideas. Furthermore, some theories are not focused on judging the practicality of the results of an event, but instead, it is more concerned with addressing the channels of input into the results. Also, more theories do not give priority to time. This is a huge mistake because the value of time is misconsidered to other less relevant resources when applying these theories in our daily life activities. Most of the iconic disclaimers vigilant to incorporating the accounting theories into the practical practice include consistency with measurability, future assessment, historical costs, estimates, changing accounting policies, verifiability, errors, and frauds.

## REFERENCES

- [1]Bebbington, J., Russell, S., & Thomson, I. (2017). Accounting and sustainable development: Reflections and propositions. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 48, 21-34.
- [2]Guerreiro, R., & Soutes, D. O. (2013). Time-based management practices: a study of Brazilian companies. *Revista Contabilidade & Finanças*, 24, 181-194.
- [3]Schroeder, R.G., Clark, M.W. and Cathey, J.M., (2019). Financial accounting theory and analysis: text and cases. John Wiley & Sons.
- [4]Maroun, W., & Atkins, J. (2018). The emancipatory potential of extinction accounting: Exploring current practice in integrated reports. In *Accounting Forum* (Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 102-118). No longer published by Elsevier.
- [5]Smith, M., 2019. Research methods in accounting. Sage.
- [6]Bueger, C. and Gadinger, F., 2018. International practice theory. Springer.
- [7]Michie, S., Johnston, M., Abraham, C., Lawton, R., Parker, D., & Walker, A. (2005). Making psychological theory useful for implementing evidence based practice: a consensus approach. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 14(1), 26-33.
- [8]Conlon, C., Timonen, V., Elliott-O'Dare, C., O'Keeffe, S., & Foley, G. (2020). Confused about theoretical sampling? Engaging theoretical

sampling in diverse grounded theory studies.  
*Qualitative Health Research*, 30(6), 947-959.

- [9]De Villiers, C., Venter, E. R., & Hsiao, P. C. K. (2017). Integrated reporting: background, measurement issues, approaches and an agenda for future research. *Accounting & Finance*, 57(4), 937-959..
- [10]Nord, J.H., Koohang, A. and Paliszkiewicz, J., (2019). The Internet of Things: Review and theoretical framework. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 133, pp.97-108.
- [11]Mittelstadt, B., (2019). Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(11), pp.501-507.
- [12]May, C.R., Cummings, A., Girling, M., Bracher, M., Mair, F.S., May, C.M., Murray, E., Myall, M., Rapley, T. and Finch, T., (2018). Using normalization process theory in feasibility studies and process evaluations of complex healthcare interventions: a systematic review. *Implementation Science*, 13(1), pp.1-27.
- [13]Li, J., Greenwood, D. and Kassem, M., 2019. Blockchain in the built environment and construction industry: A systematic review, conceptual models and practical use cases. *Automation in Construction*, 102, pp.288-307.