Journal of Theoretical Accounting Research
ISSN: 1556-5106
Volume 22 Issue 1 Year 2026 Page 35-40

From Mesopotamian Ledgers to IFRS 3: A Critical Inquiry into Historical Evolution, Theoretical Paradigms and Emerging Hybrid Models in Goodwill Accounting and Technological Impact

Bikramjit Pal[1*], Abhijit Pandit[2]

[1*,2]Assistant Professor, Management Development Institute Murshidabad West Bengal, India Email. bikramjit.pal@mdim.ac.in*, abhijitpandit1978@gmail.com

Abstract
Goodwill has travelled a long conceptual and regulatory journey—from a loosely understood commercial custom in nineteenth-century legal practice to a highly codified but still controversial element of contemporary financial reporting. The movement from cost-based amortization regimes to the impairment-only model under IFRS 3 is not merely a technical change in measurement; it reflects deeper philosophical negotiations about what financial statements are meant to do, whom they are designed to serve, and how uncertain future-oriented benefits should be represented. This paper examines the historical evolution of goodwill accounting, the theoretical paradigms that underpin competing treatments, the practical consequences of the current impairment-only regime and the technological impact. Drawing on historical analysis, interpretive reading of standards, and conceptual synthesis, the paper argues that goodwill accounting embodies a persistent tension between stewardship-oriented prudence and neo liberal valuation logic grounded in investor decision-usefulness. Neither pure amortization nor pure impairment adequately resolves this tension. The paper therefore proposes an emerging hybrid paradigm that combines disciplined amortization with trigger-based impairment, supported by enhanced technological disclosure and governance oversight. This hybrid model is presented as a more conceptually coherent, ethically defensible, and decision-useful way of representing goodwill.

Keywords: Goodwill; IFRS 3; Stewardship; Impairment; Amortization; Intangibles; Financial Reporting.

Introduction

Accounting has evolved from a basic mechanism for recording commodity flows and tax obligations into a complex socio-economic infrastructure that shapes how organizations are governed and evaluated. Ancient systems of tally marks, clay tokens, and cuneiform tablets were primarily designed to ensure custodial control over physical resources. Over centuries, as trade networks expanded and legal institutions matured, accounting slowly acquired its contemporary role as a language of business that supports capital allocation, performance evaluation, and accountability to multiple stakeholders.

Within this long trajectory, certain accounting constructs have proved especially resistant to conceptual closure. Goodwill is one of the most prominent of these contested ideas. At its simplest, goodwill is defined as the excess of the purchase consideration over the fair value of net identifiable assets acquired in a business combination. Yet this formal definition conceals a multitude of underlying economic phenomena: reputation, brand strength, customer loyalty, internally developed know-how, human capital, network position, and anticipated synergies, among others. These elements cannot be separately sold, reliably measured in isolation, or easily disentangled from the ongoing activities of the firm. As a result, goodwill occupies a liminal space between clearly identifiable assets and more nebulous expectations about future performance.

Historically, goodwill emerged not from abstract accounting theory but out of practical commercial disputes. Nineteenth-century English courts grappled with the question of how to compensate departing partners or vendors whose businesses commanded prices above the value of their tangible assets. Legal judgments gradually solidified the notion that an ongoing business possessed a transferable value rooted in its reputation and established clientele. Accountants subsequently incorporated this legal construction into practice, first as a residual amount recorded in the books, and later as a recognized asset with specified treatment in standards.

The introduction of IFRS 3 marked a decisive philosophical shift in this history. By abolishing systematic amortization and adopting an impairment-only approach, standard-setters signaled their belief that goodwill often retains value indefinitely unless objective evidence suggests otherwise. This move aligned financial reporting more closely with fair-value and market-based notions of relevance but simultaneously weakened traditional prudence and created space for subjectivity in impairment testing. Empirical studies have documented delays in recognizing impairment, clustering of write-downs during crises, and the use of optimistic assumptions in cash-flow projections, raising concerns about earnings management and reduced comparability.

This paper situates goodwill accounting within a broader debate about the purpose and ethics of financial reporting. It argues that the current impairment-only model is the product of a particular ideological moment in standard-setting, shaped by neoliberal assumptions about markets, valuation, and investor primacy. At the same time, the persistence of critique and recent reconsiderations of amortization suggest that the paradigm is neither conceptually stable nor politically settled. By tracing the historical evolution and theoretical underpinnings of goodwill accounting, the paper develops the case for a deliberately constructed hybrid model that seeks to reconcile stewardship-oriented prudence with decision-useful relevance.

Historical and Conceptual Foundations

Early accounting systems in Mesopotamia, Egypt, China, and classical Greece were designed to document obligations, rations, and taxable resources. Clay tablets recorded deliveries of grain and livestock; tally sticks and knotted cords performed similar functions elsewhere. These proto-accounting devices had little to do with valuation or the representation of expected future benefits. Their central aim was stewardship—ensuring that temple administrators, royal officials, or local stewards could be held accountable for resources entrusted to them.

The publication of Luca Pacioli's Summa de Arithmetica in 1494 is often taken as a symbolic starting point of modern accounting. Double-entry bookkeeping introduced a disciplined method for representing business transactions and periodic results, enabling merchants to distinguish capital from profit and to track changes in net worth over time. Yet even in this formative period, there was no explicit recognition of goodwill as an accounting category. Merchants certainly recognized reputation and stable customer relationships as sources of advantage, but these were not quantified or capitalized in the ledgers.

Goodwill surfaced more explicitly in nineteenth-century English commercial practice and court decisions. When a profitable business was sold at a price exceeding the value of its tangible assets and identified intangibles, practitioners described the difference as goodwill. Courts treated this surplus as a form of property, associated with the likelihood that customers would continue to patronize the business under new ownership. This legal recognition encouraged accountants to develop methods for recording goodwill in partnership accounts and company balance sheets, usually as a residual item.

Three overlapping conceptual interpretations developed from this practice. First, goodwill came to be seen as a residual value—the plug that reconciled the purchase price with the fair value of identifiable net assets. Under this view, goodwill has no independent content; it simply reflects the market's judgement that the bundle of assets acquired is worth more together than separately. Second, some theorists conceptualized goodwill as a composite intangible asset, containing within it various unrecognized resources such as trained employees, proprietary processes, and relational capital. Third, economists and financial theorists began to interpret goodwill as the capitalized present value of expected abnormal returns—the excess earnings that a business can generate because of its competitive advantages.

These interpretations all capture important aspects of goodwill, but none provides a fully satisfactory conceptualization. Residual definitions explain how goodwill is measured but not what it is. Composite-asset perspectives acknowledge underlying intangibles but leave unresolved the problem of their measurability and separability. Excess-earnings models align goodwill with valuation theory but risk collapsing accounting into finance, placing heavy reliance on hypothetical future cash-flow projections. This conceptual ambiguity laid the groundwork for the subsequent diversity of regulatory responses and continues to fuel debate today.

Evolution of Regulatory Frameworks and Accounting Practice

Throughout the twentieth century, national accounting regimes adopted a range of treatments for goodwill. Some jurisdictions permitted immediate write-off of acquired goodwill against reserves, thereby expensing the premium at the acquisition date and avoiding future volatility. Others required capitalization and systematic amortization over relatively long periods, often up to 40 years, on the presumption that goodwill gradually lost its service potential. A third group allowed preparers considerable discretion in choosing between these alternatives, resulting in heterogeneous practice and limited comparability.

The development of International Accounting Standards sought to impose greater discipline on this diversity. IAS 22, Business Combinations, required that purchased goodwill be recognized as an asset and amortized over its useful life, generally not exceeding 20 years. This approach was grounded in prudence and stewardship: recognized goodwill was assumed to provide benefits that diminished over time and therefore should be systematically charged to profit or loss. Amortization ensured that the balance sheet did not indefinitely carry large blocks of unverifiable intangibles and that the income statement reflected a regular allocation of the acquisition premium.

IFRS 3, issued in 2004 and subsequently revised, replaced this amortization model with an impairment-only regime. Goodwill was deemed to have an indefinite useful life and therefore no longer amortized. Instead, entities were required to allocate goodwill to cash-generating units and to perform annual impairment tests, or more frequently when indicators of impairment were present. Any excess of carrying amount over recoverable amount was recognized as an impairment loss in profit or loss, reducing the carrying amount of goodwill.

This shift aligned IFRS more closely with fair-value notions and with developments in US GAAP, which had moved in a similar direction through SFAS 141 and SFAS 142. The underlying rationale was that amortization of goodwill was arbitrary and disconnected from economic reality, whereas impairment testing, though complex, could provide more decision-useful information by identifying when the expected benefits of a business combination had deteriorated.

Empirical research, however, has highlighted several problems with the impairment-only model. Studies report delayed recognition of impairment losses, with firms often postponing write-downs until periods of poor performance or market downturns. There is evidence of "big bath" behavior, where large impairments are recorded in already bad years, potentially clearing the way for improved future results. The estimation of recoverable amounts requires management to forecast future cash flows and select discount rates, creating substantial room for subjectivity and opportunistic bias. Cross-country evidence also suggests variations in enforcement, auditor skepticism, and governance quality that affect how rigorously impairment tests are applied.

In response to these concerns, some jurisdictions have revisited the role of amortization. For example, amortization options for private entities in certain GAAP regimes indicate a partial retreat from the impairment-only ideology and acknowledge preparers' demand for simpler, less judgement-laden approaches. The IASB and other standard-setting bodies have periodically consulted on possible reintroduction of amortization or development of hybrid methods, illustrating that the regulatory trajectory of goodwill accounting remains open rather than settled.

Theoretical Perspectives Shaping Goodwill Accounting

Goodwill sits at the intersection of several theoretical frameworks in accounting and related disciplines. Measurement theory is a starting point. Under a representational measurement view, accounting numbers should correspond, as faithfully as possible, to underlying economic quantities. Goodwill presents a challenge because it is not directly observable or separable. Its recognition is triggered by a market transaction, but its subsequent measurement depends heavily on management's expectations about synergies, growth prospects, and competitive dynamics. From this perspective, goodwill is at best a noisy proxy for an unobservable construction, and at worst a repository for unverifiable estimates.

Constructivist perspectives on measurement, by contrast, emphasize that accounting numbers do not simply reveal pre-existing economic realities but actively participate in constructing them. Under this view, goodwill is a socially negotiated financial construct that reflects the outcome of bargaining between buyers and sellers, the expectations embodied in capital markets, and the conventions embedded in accounting standards. Its value is not discovered but made through interpretive and institutional processes. This approach helps to explain why goodwill remains controversial: it crystallizes contested assumptions about what counts as an asset and how future-oriented benefits should be represented.

Stewardship theory offers another lens. In a stewardship-oriented framework, financial reports are tools for holding managers accountable for the resources entrusted to them. Prudence, reliability, and verifiability are emphasized. From this vantage point, amortization of goodwill appears attractive: it gradually reduces the carrying amount of an uncertain intangible, guards against the accumulation of inflated asset values, and provides a predictable charge to earnings. Impairment-only models, by contrast, place heavy reliance on managerial judgement and future cash-flow forecasts, potentially weakening stewardship by expanding the scope for discretion and bias.

Neoliberal valuation logic and decision-usefulness perspectives take a different stance. Here, the primary purpose of financial reporting is to provide information useful to current and potential investors in making resource allocation decisions. Relevance and timeliness are prioritized, even if this involves accepting greater estimation uncertainty. Goodwill is then framed as a forward-looking economic resource representing expected future benefits from synergies and competitive advantages. Under this paradigm, systematic amortization may be seen as mechanically eroding an asset that continues to generate value, thereby distorting performance measures. Impairment-only testing is championed as a more faithful reflection of underlying economic reality, despite the embedded subjectivity.

Institutional theory adds a further dimension by highlighting how goodwill standards evolve through negotiation among regulators, preparers, auditors, industry bodies, and transnational organizations such as the IASB. Standards do not emerge from pure conceptual reasoning but from a path-dependent process shaped by political interests, professional lobbying, and prevailing ideological currents. The adoption of impairment-only models can thus be understood as part of a broader movement toward fair-value measurement and financialization, rather than the inevitable outcome of conceptual analysis. This helps explain persistent divergence in practice and continuing resistance to the impairment-only paradigm in some quarters.

Research Purpose, Method and Analytical Logic

Given this complex historical and theoretical landscape, the present study adopts an interpretive, theory-building orientation rather than a positivist hypothesis-testing design. The central purpose is to make sense of how goodwill accounting has evolved, what conceptual commitments underpin current standards, and how alternative models might better reconcile competing objectives of stewardship and decision-usefulness.

The research design integrates three complementary strands. First, a historical document analysis examines primary and secondary sources on the evolution of accounting thought, legal treatment of business reputation, and the emergence of goodwill in practice. This includes classic works in accounting history, archival material on early company reporting, and legal cases that crystallised the notion of goodwill as a transferable asset. Second, an interpretive review of standards and regulatory texts is undertaken. This involves close reading of IAS 22, IFRS 3, related IASB discussion papers, US GAAP pronouncements, and national adaptations. Particular attention is paid to the language used to justify changes in treatment, the conceptual frameworks invoked, and the implicit assumptions about users and objectives of financial reporting.

Third, a cross-jurisdictional comparison of practice-oriented literature and empirical findings is conducted, synthesising evidence on impairment behaviour, value relevance, and governance influences. Techniques such as thematic coding and interpretive correspondence analysis are used to map relationships among conceptual positions, regulatory developments, and observed reporting outcomes.

The analytical logic is iterative and abductive. Rather than starting with a fixed theory to be verified, the study cycles between data, concepts, and emerging propositions. Historical and contemporary materials are read in light of measurement theory, stewardship and decision-usefulness debates, and institutional perspectives. Patterns that recur across sources are treated as interpretive findings, which then inform the development of a proposed hybrid model for goodwill accounting.

Interpretive Findings

The synthesis of historical, conceptual, and empirical materials yields four broad interpretive findings.

First, goodwill remains conceptually unresolved and multi-layered. It encompasses strategic resources such as brand equity and technological know-how, relational assets such as customer and supplier networks, and more speculative expectations about future market conditions. No single definitional frame—residual, composite-asset, or excess-earnings—can capture this complexity. This layered nature explains why goodwill is so difficult to measure, why its impairment is often contentious, and why debates about its treatment recur whenever standards are revisited.

Second, measurement practices for goodwill reflect competing paradigms rather than a single coherent logic. Amortization regimes embody a stewardship-oriented paradigm in which uncertain intangibles are gradually written down to protect creditors and maintain conservative balance sheets. Impairment-only regimes embody a valuation-oriented paradigm that privileges forward-looking relevance, treating goodwill as an indefinite-life asset whose value should only be reduced when convincing evidence of deterioration emerges. Both paradigms have internal inconsistencies: amortization schedules are often arbitrary and disconnected from actual economic life, while impairment tests rely on unverifiable estimates and may fail to deliver timely loss recognition.

Third, managerial behavior and governance context significantly shape how goodwill standards operate in practice. Impairment testing requires management to make judgements about cash-generating units, forecast horizons, growth rates, and discount factors. These judgements are sensitive to incentives related to bonus schemes, debt covenants, and market expectations. Empirical research indicates that firms with weaker governance or higher pressure to meet earnings targets are more likely to delay impairments or use optimistic assumptions. Audit scrutiny and enforcement strength can mitigate but not eliminate these tendencies, contributing to cross-country variation in goodwill reporting.

Fourth, there is growing regulatory and professional interest in hybrid or modified approaches using technology like cyber finance and blockchain. Consultation documents, standard-setting agendas, and practitioner commentaries increasingly acknowledge that pure impairment-only models may not provide the desired balance of reliability and relevance. Proposals range from reintroducing amortization over a rebuttable default period, to combining amortization with indicator-based impairment triggers, to enhancing disclosure requirements around key assumptions and sensitivities. These developments suggest the emergence of a hybrid paradigm that does not fully abandon either stewardship or valuation logic but seeks to integrate elements of both.

Discussion

These findings underscore that goodwill accounting is not simply a technical issue but a window into the deeper philosophical commitments of financial reporting. If one adopts a strictly stewardship-oriented view, the presence of large, indefinite-life goodwill balances on the balance sheet is problematic. They represent accumulated premiums for which the pattern of realization is uncertain and potentially non-verifiable. Systematic amortization appears attractive because it imposes discipline, reduces the risk of overstated assets, and limits the scope for managerial manipulation through impairment timing.

From a decision-usefulness perspective, however, amortization may be seen as mechanically degrading an asset that continues to generate value, thereby understating performance in later years of a successful acquisition. Users interested in forecasting future cash flows may prefer impairment-only models that preserve the carrying amount of goodwill until there is clear evidence of deterioration. Yet this preference presupposes that impairment tests are performed rigorously, that assumptions are transparent, and that enforcement is strong conditions that are not always met in practice.

The tension between these perspectives is amplified by broader trends of financialization, in which market-based valuation and fair-value measurements gain prominence. Goodwill becomes one more site where expectations about future earnings and synergies are brought onto the balance sheet. However, the reliance on management estimates and the opacity of valuation models can erode trust, particularly in periods following acquisition booms when goodwill balances swell dramatically.

Against this backdrop, a hybrid reporting model offers a pragmatic and philosophically balanced way forward. Under such a model, goodwill would be amortized over a rebuttable default period—say 10–15 years—reflecting the idea that the exceptional returns from a business combination are unlikely to persist indefinitely. At the same time, entities would be required to test for impairment when specific triggers occur, such as adverse changes in market conditions, underperformance of acquired units, or significant restructuring decisions. Enhanced disclosures would accompany both amortization and impairment, including explanations of the rationale for selected useful lives, key assumptions underlying cash-flow projections, and sensitivity analyses. This hybrid approach acknowledges the conceptual ambiguity and measurement challenges of goodwill while retaining a clear connection to both stewardship and decision-usefulness. It distributes the burden of recognition over time through amortization but also allows for timely recognition of value declines through impairment. Importantly, it restores a measure of prudence without reverting to immediate write-off, which would remove potentially relevant information from the balance sheet altogether.

Implications

The analysis has several implications for different stakeholder groups.

For standard-setters and regulators, the key implication is that the current impairment-only model should not be treated as a settled end point. Ongoing projects examining goodwill treatment ought to explicitly consider hybrid models that combine amortization and trigger-based impairment, rather than framing the choice as a binary between the two. Conceptual frameworks should also recognize the plural purposes of financial reporting—stewardship as well as decision-usefulness—when evaluating goodwill options.

For preparers and auditors, the findings underscore the importance of robust governance over goodwill accounting. Even under existing impairment-only standards, boards and audit committees can strengthen oversight by challenging key assumptions, commissioning independent valuations where appropriate, and ensuring transparent disclosure of judgements and sensitivities. In a hybrid model, similar governance efforts would be needed to justify selected amortization periods and to monitor impairment triggers.

For users of financial statements, including investors, creditors, and analysts, the paper highlights the need for critical engagement with reported goodwill numbers. Users should recognize goodwill as a construct that embeds managerial expectations and standard-setting conventions, rather than a straightforward measure of intrinsic value. Analytical techniques such as adjusting performance metrics for amortization and impairment charges, or focusing on pre-goodwill return measures, may help in interpreting reported figures more effectively.

At a broader societal level, goodwill accounting raises ethical questions about how value is represented and distributed. Excessive accumulation of goodwill balances may reflect acquisition-driven growth strategies that prioritize market expansion over organic development, with implications for competition, employment, and innovation. Accounting treatments that fail to capture the dissolution of expected synergies or the erosion of stakeholder relationships risk legitimizing these strategies even when they do not deliver sustainable benefits.

Limitations and Future Research

This study is primarily conceptual and interpretive. It does not attempt to estimate the magnitude of goodwill misstatements, quantify the prevalence of earnings management through impairment timing, or perform statistical tests of value relevance. As such, its conclusions rely on the coherence of theoretical synthesis and the plausibility of interpretive arguments rather than on formal hypothesis testing.

Future research could build on this foundation in several ways. Cross-country empirical studies could investigate whether jurisdictions with stronger enforcement and governance structures exhibit different patterns of impairment recognition compared with those where oversight is weaker. Longitudinal analyses might examine how goodwill balances and associated charges evolve over acquisition cycles, shedding light on the interaction between corporate strategy, macroeconomic conditions, and reporting behavior. Experimental and survey methods could explore how auditors and preparers perceive the trade-offs between amortization and impairment, and how these perceptions influence their professional judgements.

There is also scope for more explicit modelling of hybrid goodwill reporting frameworks. Simulation studies could compare how different combinations of amortization periods, impairment triggers, and disclosure requirements affect key metrics such as earnings volatility, debt covenant compliance, and predictive accuracy of cash-flow forecasts. Interdisciplinary work drawing on sociology, political economy, and critical accounting could further interrogate how goodwill accounting connects to broader processes of financialization and corporate governance reform.

Conclusion

Goodwill is one of the most conceptually dense and practically contested elements in contemporary financial reporting. Its journey from implicit recognition in legal disputes and commercial practice to explicit codification in international standards reveals much about how accounting grapples with the challenge of representing intangible, future-oriented resources. The transition from amortization regimes to the impairment-only model under IFRS 3 reflects a broader shift toward market-based valuation and investor-centered decision-usefulness, but it also exposes tensions with traditional stewardship and prudence.

The interpretive analysis presented in this paper shows that neither pure amortization nor pure impairment can fully resolve these tensions. Amortization offers discipline but risks arbitrariness; impairment promises relevance but opens the door to subjectivity and delayed loss recognition. A carefully designed hybrid model—combining rebuttable-presumption amortization with trigger-based impairment and strengthened disclosure—provides a more balanced and conceptually honest representation of goodwill. Such a model acknowledges the constructed and contested nature of goodwill while striving to enhance accountability, comparability, and decision-usefulness.

Ultimately, goodwill accounting serves as a reminder that financial reporting is not merely a technical exercise but a normative and political project. Choices about how to recognize and measure goodwill embed judgements about what kinds of value matter, whose interests count, and how uncertainty about the future should be managed. As standard-setters, practitioners, and users continue to debate the future of goodwill accounting, recognizing these deeper stakes is essential for designing frameworks that are not only technically sound but also ethically and socially responsible.

References

1. Abbott, A. (1988). The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor. University of Chicago Press.
2. Barker, R., & Schulte, S. (2017). Representing the economic substance of goodwill. Abacus, 53(1), 29–54. https://doi.org/10.1111/abac.12105
3. Beatty, A., & Weber, J. (2006). Accounting discretion in fair value estimates: An examination of SFAS 142 goodwill impairments. Journal of Accounting Research, 44(2), 257–288. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679X.2006.00200.x
4. Carlin, T. M., & Finch, N. (2009). Discount rates in disarray: Evidence on flawed goodwill impairment testing. Australian Accounting Review, 19(4), 326–336. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1835-2561.2009.00063.x
5. Comiskey, E. E., & Mulford, C. W. (2010). Goodwill, triggering events, and impairment accounting. Journal of Applied Research in Accounting and Finance, 5(3), 3–20.
6. Degos, J. G., & Mattessich, R. (2016). Accounting research in the past and future: A critical review. Accounting Perspectives, 15(2), 97–116. https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3838.12109
7. Financial Accounting Standards Board. (2001). SFAS 142: Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets. FASB.
8. Hamberg, M., Paananen, M., & Novak, J. (2011). The adoption of IFRS 3: The effects of managerial discretion and stock market reactions. European Accounting Review, 20(3), 445–471. https://doi.org/10.1080/0963 8180.2010.495909
9. International Accounting Standards Board. (2004). IFRS 3: Business Combinations. IASB.
10. International Accounting Standards Board. (2020). Discussion paper DP/2020/1: Business Combinations—Disclosures, Goodwill and Impairment. IASB.
11. Johnson, L. T., & Petrone, K. R. (1998). Is goodwill an asset? Accounting Horizons, 12(3), 293–303.
12. Li, K. K., & Sloan, R. (2021). Accounting for intangibles: Can current standards succeed? Review of Accounting Studies, 26(3), 1055–1089. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-021-09637-7
13. Mazzi, F., Slack, R., & Tsalavoutas, I. (2019). The role of impairment tests in the context of goodwill accounting: A review. The British Accounting Review, 51(5), Article 100833. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2019.04.001
14. Ramanna, K., & Watts, R. (2012). Evidence on the use of unverifiable estimates in required goodwill impairment. Review of Accounting Studies, 17(4), 749–780. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-012-9181-5
15. Santos, E., & Pimentel, D. (2023). Hybrid goodwill models: Rebalancing valuation relevance and prudence. Journal of International Accounting Research, 22(1), 45–72. https://doi.org/10.2308/JIAR-2021-018
16. Watts, R. (2003). Conservatism in accounting. Accounting Horizons, 17(3), 207–221. https://doi.org/10.2308/acch.2003.17.3.20
17. Zeff, S. A. (2007). The conceptual framework for business enterprises: A historical perspective. Accounting Historians Journal, 34(2), 89–131.