Harmonization, Convergence and Divergence of Accounting Standards: A Literature Synthesis

Eneisik Gogo Erasmus
Department of Accounting
Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria
eneisikgogo@ymail.com
DOI: 10.56201/jafm.vol.11.no5.2025.pg43.62

Abstract
Global efforts to improve financial reporting have led to increased attention on harmonization, convergence, and divergence of accounting standards, especially with the adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards. However, challenges persist, particularly in developing countries. The study explores the benefits and challenges of harmonizing and converging accounting standards and to examine the causes and effects of divergence. This study adopts a literature review approach, relying on secondary resources from scholarly articles, reports, and official publications. The study is anchored on institutional theory, which explains how institutional pressures influence the adoption and implementation of international accounting standards. Harmonization aims to enhance comparability by reducing disparities in national accounting practices, while convergence seeks the adoption of a single set of high-quality international standards, notably the International Financial Reporting Standards. However, divergence continues to persist due to institutional, cultural, legal, and economic factors that influence both the adoption and implementation of global standards. The study reveals that while significant progress has been made in formal convergence, substantive convergence remains elusive, especially in developing and transitional economies. Divergence, whether unintentional or deliberate, reflects deeper structural and contextual realities that challenge the ideal of global uniformity in accounting standard. The study finds that harmonization and convergence improve comparability and transparency, divergence remains due to institutional, cultural, and enforcement differences. The study concludes that true global alignment in accounting standards requires more than formal adoption; it demands strong institutions, effective enforcement, and contextual understanding. The study recommends, among other things, the strengthening of enforcement bodies, capacity building in developing countries through training and education, enhanced global cooperation among standard-setting and regulatory institutions, and the development of tailored guidance to support the effective implementation of International Financial Reporting Standards in diverse environments.

Keywords: *Harmonization, Convergence and Divergence of Accounting Standards*

Introduction

In an era distinct by the intensification of global economic integration, the need for a unified approach to financial reporting has become more pressing than ever. The harmonization, convergence, and divergence of accounting standards are three interrelated but conceptually different phenomena that have garnered substantial attention in accounting research and practice. Amid the rise of multinational corporations, cross border investments, and international capital markets, the quest for comparable, transparent, and reliable financial information has necessitated reforms in accounting regulation and practice (Nobes & Parker, 2020). Harmonization and convergence represent global efforts to reduce disparities in accounting standards, while divergence reflects the persistence of differences due to national, cultural, economic, and political factors (Choi & Meek, 2014). Harmonization is the process of increasing the compatibility of accounting practices by reducing differences without necessarily making them uniform (Nobes & Stadler, 2015). Convergence implies the movement towards a single set of high quality global accounting standards, represented by the adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards (Zeff, 2012). Harmonization is the strategic alignment and integration of diverse national accounting principles into a coherent and comparable global financial reporting framework, aimed at enhancing transparency, consistency, and cross-border economic understanding without erasing local relevance or regulatory autonomy while convergence is a deliberate and progressive process through which distinct national accounting systems evolve toward a unified set of globally accepted principles minimizing differences, eliminating redundancies, and fostering uniformity in financial reporting to support global investment, accountability, and comparability. Diversity is the coexistence of varied accounting rules, principles, and practices shaped by a nation's legal system, economic environment, cultural values, and regulatory needs reflecting the multifaceted nature of global financial reporting and the challenges of achieving uniformity in a heterogeneous world. In contrast, divergence denotes the continued existence of distinct accounting standards and practices across different jurisdictions, often due to deeply rooted institutional and contextual factors (Ding et al., 2007). Harmonization is the process of aligning accounting standards and practices to improve the comparability of financial information across borders, while allowing for certain national differences (Choi & Meek, 2014). The primary aim of harmonization is to reduce significant disparities in accounting treatments for similar economic transactions without necessarily enforcing a uniform set of standards. Harmonization acknowledges the diversity of accounting environments but seeks to mitigate the resulting confusion and inefficiencies in global capital markets. Early international efforts, such as those led by the International Accounting Standards Committee and later the International Accounting Standards Board, were centered on promoting harmonization as a feasible alternative to strict standard uniformity (Zeff, 2012). Harmonization gained momentum in the 1980s and 1990s when multinational corporations, international investors, and lending institutions began to demand more reliable and comparable financial statements from entities operating in different countries (Nobes & Stadler, 2015).

Convergence, though closely related to harmonization, represents a more ambitious process moving towards the adoption of a single set of high quality global accounting standards. The convergence agenda implies the gradual elimination of differences between national standards and international standards such as International Financial Reporting Standards (Hail et al., 2010). Ball (2006) stated that convergence serves as a strategic response to globalization by facilitating uniform financial reporting, reducing information asymmetry, and enhancing investor confidence. The most notable effort in convergence has been the collaboration between the International Accounting Standards Board and the U.S. Financial Accounting Standards Board, initiated through the Norwalk Agreement in 2002 (Financial Accounting Standards Board & International Accounting Standards Board, 2002). This agreement laid the foundation for joint projects aimed at achieving consistency between International Financial Reporting Standards and U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. Many jurisdictions have fully adopted International Financial Reporting Standards; the convergence process remains incomplete, with some countries opting for adaptation rather than adoption (IFRS Foundation, 2023).

In contrast to harmonization and convergence, divergence is the persistence or even widening of differences in accounting standards and practices across jurisdictions. Divergence arises due to various institutional, cultural, legal, and economic factors that shape national accounting systems (Ding et al., 2007). Differences in investor protection laws, tax regulations, enforcement mechanisms, and cultural attitudes towards transparency significantly influence how standards are applied in practice even when the formal standards are similar (Nobes, 2006). Divergence may also result from resistance to external standard-setting bodies or skepticism about the suitability of International Financial Reporting Standards for domestic needs. As noted by Ramanna and Sletten (2014), countries with strong institutional frameworks may resist International Financial Reporting Standards adoption if they perceive local standards as more robust or better suited to their economic contexts. Additionally, political considerations, such as concerns over sovereignty in financial regulation, often hinder convergence and sustain divergence. Harmonization and convergence are both reformative processes aimed at increasing the comparability and transparency of financial information; they differ in scope and methodology. Harmonization accommodates diversity with a focus on compatibility, whereas convergence seeks uniformity and consistency (Nobes & Parker, 2020). Divergence, on the other hand, serves as both a counterpoint and a constraint to harmonization and convergence, often highlighting the real world complexities that undermine the ideal of a single global accounting language. In practice, the coexistence of these three phenomena reflects the dynamic and contested nature of international accounting regulation. As such, any analysis of the international accounting landscape must recognize that harmonization and convergence are ongoing processes, constantly shaped and sometimes obstructed by forces of divergence.

The International Accounting Standards Board and the Financial Accounting Standards Board have played pivotal roles in fostering the convergence agenda, with initiatives such as the Norwalk Agreement in 2002 marking a significant milestone in transatlantic accounting collaboration (FASB & IASB, 2002). However, despite these efforts, the path toward global uniformity in accounting remains uneven and fraught with challenges. Many countries have adopted International Financial Reporting Standards or aligned their national standards with it, others most notably the United States have retained their domestic Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, leading to a coexistence of convergent and divergent tendencies (Hail et al., 2010). Moreover, empirical research has demonstrated that even when countries adopt International Financial Reporting Standards, variations in enforcement mechanisms, legal systems, economic development, and cultural values may result in divergent outcomes in practice (Ball, 2006; Nobes, 2006). These inconsistencies raise critical questions about the true extent of convergence and the feasibility of achieving genuine global harmonization. The complex interplay between international standard setting bodies, national regulators, and domestic stakeholders further complicates the trajectory of accounting standard evolution. This study seeks to synthesize the growing body of literature on the harmonization, convergence, and divergence of accounting standards, identifying key themes, theoretical frameworks, methodological approaches, and empirical findings. By critically reviewing scholarly contributions, this study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the progress, limitations, and future prospects of global accounting standardization. Furthermore, this synthesis intends to contribute to the discourse on how contextual and institutional factors shape the adoption, implementation, and outcomes of accounting reforms across different jurisdictions. In view of the ongoing debates and conflicting findings in the literature, this review is both timely and essential. It not only highlights the theoretical underpinnings and empirical evidence surrounding global accounting standardization but also underscores the challenges that lie ahead in reconciling international ideals with local realities.

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

Institutional Theory

Institutional theory was first propounded by John W. Meyer and Brian Rowan in 1977 in their influential paper titled Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony**.** Later, scholars like DiMaggio and Powell (1983) expanded on it significantly with their concept of institutional isomorphism, which explains why organizations tend to become similar over time. Institutional Theory explains how organizations are influenced by the institutional environment in which they operate such as laws, regulations, professional norms, cultural expectations, and industry standards. The theory argues that organizations conform not only to achieve technical efficiency but also to gain legitimacy**,** resources, and survival advantage in their environment. Institutional theory provides a robust framework for understanding how organizational and national behavior is shaped by institutional norms, rules, and expectations. In the context of international accounting, institutional theory posits that countries and organizations adopt accounting standards such as International Financial Reporting Standards. not merely for efficiency or economic benefits, but to gain legitimacy, respond to coercive pressures, and conform to globally accepted norms (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott, 2014). Three mechanisms of institutional isomorphism coercive, mimetic, and normative are particularly relevant. Coercive isomorphism occurs when countries adopt International Financial Reporting Standards due to external pressures from global institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, or the European Union (Judge et al., 2010). Mimetic isomorphism arises when countries emulate the accounting systems of developed economies to gain credibility and attract foreign investment. Normative isomorphism reflects the influence of the accounting profession and international standard-setting bodies in shaping local practices. Institutional theory also explains the persistence of divergence. In countries where local institutional arrangements such as legal systems, tax laws, and enforcement mechanisms are deeply embedded, adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards may be symbolic rather than substantive, leading to decoupling between formal adoption and practical implementation (Tsamenyi et al., 2006). Institutional theory helps explain why countries adopt international standards like International Financial Reporting Standards not always for efficiency, but for legitimacy, global alignment, and pressure from stakeholders. The theory allows the study to capture both sides of the phenomenon why some countries conform (converge) and why others resist or adapt differently (diverge). It recognizes the influence of politics, culture, and institutional pressures beyond pure economic or technical reasons in shaping accounting practices. The theory is useful for analyzing harmonization/convergence at different levels national, organizational, and professional.

Conceptual Review

The Historical Development of Accounting Standards

The evolution of accounting standards is deeply rooted in the development of trade, business practices, and economic systems. As businesses became more complex, there emerged a necessity for standardized accounting practices to ensure transparency, comparability, and consistency in financial reporting. The development of accounting standards is traced through various historical periods, each marked by significant milestones in regulation, institutional frameworks, and global cooperation. The earliest forms of accounting is traced back to ancient Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Greece, where rudimentary record-keeping methods were used primarily for agricultural, tax, and trade purposes (Chatfield, 1974). Clay tablets from Mesopotamia dating back to 3300 BC show that bookkeeping was used to record commercial transactions, especially in temples and palaces (Mattessich, 2000). The development of double-entry bookkeeping marked a significant leap in the history of accounting. This method was formalized by the publication of "Summa de Arithmetica, Geometria, Proportioni et Proportionalità" by Luca Pacioli in 1494. Though he did not invent double-entry accounting, Pacioli described the system used by Venetian merchants, including the use of journals and ledgers, debits and credits, and trial balances (Pacioli, 1494). His work laid the foundation for modern accounting and underscored the need for systematic record-keeping. The Industrial Revolution in the 18th and 19th centuries brought about a transformation in the scale of businesses, especially with the rise of joint-stock companies. The increased complexity of financial activities created a need for better financial reporting systems and, eventually, regulation. In the United Kingdom, the Joint Stock Companies Act of 1844 mandated the publication of annual financial statements, which was one of the first steps toward formal regulation (Napier, 1996). However, standards at this stage were not codified, and practices varied widely. The latter part of the 19th century saw the formation of professional accounting bodies, such as the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW) in 1880, and the American Institute of Accountants (now AICPA) in 1887. These bodies sought to standardize accounting practices among their members. However, their influence was initially limited to ethical conduct and professional competence rather than enforceable accounting standards (Zeff, 2007). The need for formal accounting standards became evident during the 1929 stock market crash and the ensuing Great Depression. In response, the U.S. Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 were enacted, leading to the establishment of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). The SEC was empowered to prescribe accounting standards for public companies, but it delegated this responsibility to private sector bodies like the Committee on Accounting Procedure (CAP), established by the AICPA in 1939 (Zeff, 2003). Committee on Accounting Procedure (CAP) (1939–1959): Issued 51 Accounting Research Bulletins (ARBs). It was criticized for its piecemeal approach and was replaced by the Accounting Principles Board (APB). Accounting Principles Board (APB) (1959–1973): Issued 31 Opinions but failed to develop a comprehensive theoretical framework.

Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) (1973–Present): Replaced the APB and became the main body responsible for issuing U.S., Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). It introduced the Conceptual Framework to underpin standards (FASB, 1978). With globalization and the growth of multinational corporations, the need for international accounting harmonization became urgent. In 1973, the International Accounting Standards Committee was formed by professional bodies from ten countries to issue International Accounting Standards (IASs) (Camfferman & Zeff, 2007). However, the IASC faced challenges in enforcement and global acceptance. In 2001, the IASC was reorganized into the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB), which began issuing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). IFRS aimed at providing a single set of high-quality, understandable, and enforceable global standards (IASB, 2001). IFRS standards have since been adopted by over 140 jurisdictions worldwide. Efforts to converge U.S. GAAP and IFRS have been ongoing. The Norwalk Agreement of 2002 marked a formal commitment between the FASB and IASB to work toward compatibility. Despite progress, full convergence has not been achieved due to differences in legal, regulatory, and economic environments. In recent years, the focus has expanded to include sustainability reporting and integrated reporting. The International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) was established in 2021 under the IFRS Foundation to develop comprehensive global sustainability disclosure standards. This represents the next phase in the evolution of accounting standards as stakeholders demand more information on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) issues (IFRS Foundation, 2021). The historical development of accounting standards reflects a continuous response to economic, political, and social changes. From rudimentary record-keeping in ancient civilizations to the sophisticated global frameworks of today, accounting standards have evolved to meet the demands of transparency, comparability, and accountability. With increasing globalization and the rise of sustainability concerns, accounting standards will continue to evolve to address emerging challenges.

Harmonization of Accounting Standards

The harmonization of accounting standards has been a central theme in international accounting discourse since the 1970s, driven by the need to improve the comparability of financial reports across countries (Nobes & Parker, 2020). There are several drivers of harmonization, including globalization, the growth of multinational enterprises, and increasing cross-border capital flows. Early works by Samuels and Piper (1985) highlighted the conceptual and practical necessity of harmonization, particularly in reducing the cost of financial statement analysis and enhancing investor confidence in multinational markets. Harmonization efforts initially focused on reducing material differences among national accounting practices without necessarily replacing local standards. For instance, the International Accounting Standards Committee, established in 1973, sought to issue standards that could be adopted or adapted by different jurisdictions (Zeff, 2012). Tay and Parker (1990), examined the ideological and technical influences on international harmonization, revealing the influence of Anglo-American accounting models in shaping global discourse. However, critics argue that harmonization may be more aspirational than practical. Ding et al. (2007) suggests that the alignment of standards does not necessarily lead to harmonized practices due to institutional and cultural variations in enforcement and interpretation.

The harmonization of accounting standards has been a central focus of global financial reporting discourse for decades. With the increasing globalization of markets, the need for a uniform set of accounting standards has become crucial for enhancing the comparability, transparency, and reliability of financial statements across borders (Nobes & Parker, 2020). Harmonization seeks to align different national accounting systems to reduce discrepancies in financial reporting and facilitate international investment and economic integration. Harmonization is the process of increasing the compatibility of accounting practices by reducing differences in financial reporting standards among countries (Choi & Meek, 2011). Unlike standardization, which implies a complete uniformity, harmonization allows for some degree of flexibility while promoting convergence toward commonly accepted principles such as those provided by the International Financial Reporting Standards. The primary rationale behind harmonization is to ensure comparability of financial information, thereby aiding investors, regulators, and other stakeholders in making informed economic decisions (Schroeder et al., 2019). Harmonized standards reduce the cost of capital, enhance cross-border investment, and strengthen investor confidence (Ball, 2006). Efforts to harmonize accounting standards began in earnest during the 1970s, spearheaded by international organizations such as the International Accounting Standards Committee, the predecessor of the International Accounting Standards Board. The International Accounting Standards Board, established in 2001, has since become the leading body responsible for developing and promoting

International Financial Reporting Standards globally (Camfferman & Zeff, 2015). Many countries have adopted International Financial Reporting Standards or aligned their national standards with International Financial Reporting Standards, particularly within the European Union, Africa, and parts of Asia. For example, Nigeria adopted International Financial Reporting Standards in 2012 to align its financial reporting framework with global practices. Numerous benefits have been associated with harmonized accounting standards. First, harmonization enhances financial statement comparability, enabling investors to evaluate financial performance across different jurisdictions. Second, it reduces information asymmetry and improves the efficiency of capital markets.

Third, harmonization promotes economic integration by reducing reporting costs for multinational corporations and improving regulatory oversight. Despite its benefits, harmonization faces several challenges. Differences in legal systems, cultural values, tax regimes, and levels of economic development can hinder uniform adoption (Gray, 1988). Additionally, critics argue that the one-size-fits-all nature of International Financial Reporting Standards may not suit all countries, especially developing economies with unique institutional settings (Zeff, 2007). Moreover, even among countries that have adopted International Financial Reporting Standards, empirical evidence suggests variations in interpretation and implementation, leading to what some scholars term "formal harmonization without substantive convergence" (Street & Gray, 2001). Empirical research has yielded mixed results regarding the effectiveness of harmonization. Barth et al. (2008) found that firms applying International Financial Reporting Standards show higher accounting quality. However, other studies (Ahmed et al., 2013) suggest that improvements in financial reporting are more influenced by enforcement mechanisms and institutional factors than by the mere adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards. In the Nigerian context, Iyoha and Faboyede (2011) noted that while International Financial Reporting Standards adoption improved transparency, challenges such as limited technical capacity and resistance to change affected effective implementation. Harmonization of accounting standards remains a critical objective for the global accounting community. While significant progress has been made, particularly with the widespread adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards, numerous challenges remain in ensuring true convergence in practice. Future research should focus on the effectiveness of enforcement mechanisms, the role of cultural and institutional contexts, and the actual impact of harmonized standards on financial reporting quality.

Convergence of Accounting Standards

The shift from harmonization to convergence represents a significant transformation in global accounting policy. Convergence emphasizes the replacement of national standards with a single set of international standards, most notably the International Financial Reporting Standards developed by the International Accounting Standards Board. The convergence movement gained momentum in the early 2000s, particularly with the EU's mandatory adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards in 2005 and the Norwalk Agreement between the International Accounting Standards Board and Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB & IASB, 2002). Scholars such as Ball (2006) argue that convergence promotes high-quality, investor-focused financial reporting that enhances global market efficiency. Similarly, Hail et al. (2010) provide evidence that International Financial Reporting Standards adoption is associated with increased market liquidity and reduced cost of capital. These findings underscore the benefits of convergence in improving financial transparency and economic performance. Despite its promise, convergence has faced numerous obstacles. The United States has not adopted International Financial Reporting Standards, and other jurisdictions have implemented International Financial Reporting Standards with modifications, undermining uniformity (Brown, 2011).

Christensen et al. (2008) and Daske et al. (2008) highlight the distinction between *de jure* and *de facto* convergence, noting that the mere adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards does not guarantee substantive changes in reporting quality. Moreover, convergence has also raised concerns about the suitability of International Financial Reporting Standards for developing countries. Studies such as those by Albu and Albu (2012) and Zeghal and Mhedhbi (2006) show that in environments with weak regulatory frameworks, International Financial Reporting Standards implementation often lacks rigor, limiting the intended benefits. The convergence of accounting standards has emerged as a significant movement in the globalization of financial reporting. As businesses increasingly operate across borders, the demand for a common accounting language to enhance the comparability, transparency, and reliability of financial statements has intensified (Nobes & Parker, 2020). Convergence refers to the process by which national accounting standards are aligned or harmonized with globally recognized standards, particularly the International Financial Reporting Standards issued by the International Accounting Standards Board. Accounting standards convergence entails the reduction of differences between national accounting standards and International Financial Reporting Standards, ultimately seeking a single set of high-quality, globally accepted accounting standards (Ball, 2006). Unlike harmonization, which allows for some flexibility and coexistence of multiple systems, convergence implies a stronger commitment toward uniformity in accounting practices (Beke, 2010). The process is driven by the belief that a single set of accounting standards will facilitate international capital mobility; reduce the cost of financial reporting for multinational corporations, and increase investor confidence (Barth et al., 2008). Convergence initiatives gained momentum in the early 2000s following the formation of the International Accounting Standards Board in 2001.

One of the most significant milestones was the 2002 Norwalk Agreement between the International Accounting Standards Board and the Financial Accounting Standards Board of the United States, where both boards agreed to work toward eliminating differences between International Financial Reporting Standards and U.S. GAAP (Camfferman & Zeff, 2015). Several countries have subsequently adopted or converged their standards with International Financial Reporting Standards. For instance, Nigeria adopted International Financial Reporting Standards in 2012 to enhance comparability of its financial reports with global standards (Iyoha & Jimoh, 2011). The European Union mandated International Financial Reporting Standards for all listed companies starting in 2005, marking a significant milestone in global convergence. The primary motivations behind convergence are rooted in economic, political, and professional considerations. From an economic perspective, converged standards reduce information asymmetry, enhance financial statement comparability, and attract foreign investment (Armstrong et al., 2010). Politically, convergence helps countries align with international financial systems and regulatory expectations. Professionally, it reflects a global consensus within the accounting profession to adopt best practices and consistent standards (Choi & Meek, 2011). Furthermore, convergence reduces the financial reporting burden for multinational companies operating in multiple jurisdictions and simplifies the training and education of accountants' worldwide (Schroeder et al., 2019). Numerous studies highlight the positive outcomes of convergence. Barth et al. (2008) found that companies adopting International Financial Reporting Standards exhibit higher accounting quality, including greater value relevance and less earnings management. Similarly, Daske et al. (2008) noted that International Financial Reporting Standardsc adoption and convergence lead to increased market liquidity, lower cost of capital, and improved firm transparency. In developing

economies like Nigeria, convergence with International Financial Reporting Standards has been shown to improve the reliability of financial statements, foster investor confidence, and enhance access to global capital markets (Iyoha & Faboyede, 2011).
Despite its advantages, the convergence process faces several institutional, technical, and cultural challenges. Critics argue that International Financial Reporting Standards may not always suit the economic realities of all countries, particularly developing ones with unique legal, regulatory, and business environments (Zeff, 2007). There are also concerns about the complexity and cost of transition, including the need for retraining of accounting personnel, system upgrades, and reeducation of stakeholders (Beke, 2010). Furthermore, convergence does not guarantee uniform interpretation and enforcement**.** Even where International Financial Reporting Standards is adopted, differences persist in how standards are applied, leading to what some scholars refer to as "form-over-substance convergence (Street & Gray, 2001). Empirical studies offer mixed evidence regarding the effectiveness of convergence. Armstrong et al. (2010) demonstrated positive market reactions to International Financial Reporting Standards adoption in Europe, indicating investor support for convergence. Ahmed et al. (2013) argued that improvements in accounting quality depend more on enforcement mechanisms than on standard adoption alone. In the Nigerian context, research by Iyoha and Jimoh (2011) suggests that while convergence with International Financial Reporting Standards has increased the quality of financial reporting, institutional weaknesses, such as inadequate enforcement, still limit the full realization of convergence benefits. The convergence of accounting standards represents a critical step toward enhancing global financial reporting. While significant progress has been made, particularly through International Financial Reporting Standards adoption in various jurisdictions, convergence remains an ongoing process fraught with challenges. Achieving substantive convergence requires not only the adoption of standards but also institutional strengthening, consistent enforcement, and cultural alignment. Continued scholarly inquiry and policy attention are necessary to sustain the momentum of global accounting convergence.

Divergence in Accounting Standards
Harmonization and convergence dominate reform narratives, divergence persists as a countervailing force. Divergence refers to the maintenance of differences in accounting standards and practices, often rooted in legal, cultural, economic, and institutional contexts. Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimensions and Gray's (1988) accounting values framework provide a theoretical basis for understanding how national culture influences accounting systems. Empirical studies have documented significant divergence even after International Financial Reporting Standards adoption. Nobes (2006) found that countries interpret and apply International Financial Reporting Standards differently due to variations in enforcement mechanisms, legal systems, and professional judgment. Soderstrom and Sun (2007) argue that without strong institutional infrastructure, International Financial Reporting Standards adoption may result in form-over-substance compliance, leading to continued divergence in practice. Furthermore, divergence is not always involuntary. Some countries deliberately maintain distinct standards to serve domestic objectives, such as taxation, regulatory compliance, or political autonomy (Ramanna & Sletten, 2014). For instance, China's convergence with International Financial Reporting Standards has been strategically calibrated to support its economic agenda while preserving state control over financial reporting (Peng & van der Laan Smith, 2010). These findings suggest that divergence is not simply a failure to converge but reflects deeper contextual realities that must be acknowledged in any effort toward international accounting standardization. Divergence in accounting standards refers to

the persistence of differences in financial reporting frameworks, practices, interpretations, and implementations across countries, despite ongoing global efforts toward harmonization and convergence. While initiatives led by the International Accounting Standards Board and other bodies have promoted the adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards globally, full uniformity in accounting remains elusive (Nobes & Parker, 2020).

Divergence is a critical issue because it affects the comparability, consistency, and credibility of financial information across jurisdictions, impacting investor confidence and global financial integration (Zeff, 2007). Divergence arises when accounting practices, interpretations, or enforcement mechanisms differ**,** even under a common set of standards such as International Financial Reporting Standards. Nobes (1998) distinguishes between de jure convergence the formal adoption of similar accounting rules and de facto divergence the actual differences in implementation and practice. Divergence can be classified into: Structural divergence: Differences in national accounting regulations. Enforcement divergence: Differences in how standards are applied and regulated. Cultural and institutional divergence: Variations in legal systems, economic development, tax structures, and cultural attitudes toward financial disclosure (Gray, 1988; Hofstede, 1980). The causes of divergence are legal systems and regulatory environments**:** Countries with common law systems (e.g., UK, USA) tend to support investor-driven financial reporting, while code law systems (e.g., Germany, France) focus more on creditor protection and tax reporting. These differences lead to varied interpretations of accounting principles (La Porta et al., 1998). Cultural Factors: Gray's (1988) model links cultural dimensions (as defined by Hofstede) to accounting values such as conservatism, secrecy, and professionalism. For instance, countries with high uncertainty avoidance and power distance may prefer rigid, rule-based accounting practices, while others may support more flexible, principle-based approaches. Economic and Political Contexts**:** Developing countries, such as Nigeria, often struggle with implementing International Financial Reporting Standards due to resource constraints**,** lack of expertise, and institutional weaknesses (Iyoha & Faboyede, 2011). Political instability and weak legal enforcement also hinder consistent application. Taxation and Fiscal Policy**:** In some countries, accounting standards are closely linked to tax laws. This linkage discourages full adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards principles, especially when International Financial Reporting Standards based financial statements conflict with national tax reporting requirements (Street & Gray, 2001).

Several studies have documented the persistence of divergence, even among International Financial Reporting Standards adopting countries. Street and Gray (2001) found that many companies in Europe failed to fully comply with International Financial Reporting Standards disclosure requirements. Similarly, Ball et al. (2003) showed that financial reporting practices in East Asia remained influenced by national incentives despite International Financial Reporting Standards adoption. Ahmed et al. (2013) argued that improvements in financial reporting quality following International Financial Reporting Standards adoption are often driven more by institutional factors**,** such as regulatory enforcement, than by the standards themselves. Thus, countries with strong institutions show better compliance, while others diverge in practice. In Nigeria, Iyoha and Jimoh (2011) observed that although the country adopted International Financial Reporting Standards in 2012, actual practices continue to diverge due to limited technical capacity, resistance from stakeholders, and weak enforcement**.** Divergence undermines the comparability and reliability of financial statements across countries. Investors may misinterpret financial information due to inconsistent application, leading to misallocation of capital. Furthermore, multinational corporations face increased compliance costs and complexity when preparing financial statements in divergent regulatory environments (Barth et al., 2008). The presence of divergence also casts doubt on the effectiveness of global convergence projects and raises questions about the viability of a truly global accounting language (Zeff, 2007). To minimize divergence in accounting standards, organizations and standard-setting bodies should strengthen enforcement mechanisms through independent regulatory authorities. They should also invest in capacity building in developing countries through training and education, enhance global cooperation among standard-setting and oversight institutions, and develop context-specific guidance to support the implementation of International Financial Reporting Standards in diverse environments (Camfferman & Zeff, 2015).

Benefits and Challenges of Harmonization, Convergence, and Divergence of Accounting Standards

The globalization of capital markets has intensified the need for comparable, transparent, and reliable financial reporting across countries. Consequently, the concepts of harmonization**,** convergence, and divergence of accounting standards have become focal points in international accounting research and practice. Harmonization refers to the process of aligning accounting principles across different jurisdictions (Choi & Meek, 2011), while convergence denotes the unification of national standards with a single global set particularly the International Financial Reporting Standards issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (Nobes & Parker, 2020). In contrast, divergence occurs when differences persist due to cultural, legal, or institutional factors despite efforts at standard alignment (Zeff, 2007). This review explores the benefits and challenges of these phenomena and their implications for global financial reporting. The harmonization and convergence of accounting standards enable stakeholders to compare financial statements of entities across countries with greater ease and reliability. This comparability fosters informed decision-making by investors and reduces information asymmetry (Barth et al., 2008). It also improves the transparency and credibility of financial reporting, which enhances trust in global financial markets (Ball, 2006). Uniform accounting standards can reduce the cost of capital by mitigating the risk perceived by foreign investors. Armstrong et al. (2010) noted that International Financial Reporting Standards adoption and convergence improve market liquidity and investor confidence, thereby attracting more cross-border investment. The predictability and reliability of financial statements serve as key factors in investment decisions. Convergence minimizes the financial reporting burden on multinational corporations by reducing the need to prepare multiple sets of financial statements for different jurisdictions (Beke, 2010). This simplification leads to cost savings, operational efficiency, and consistency in global financial reporting. Harmonized standards support the mobility of accounting professionals by creating a unified framework for education, certification, and practice.

It facilitates international collaboration among accounting firms and promotes professional development across borders (Schroeder et al., 2019). Despite formal convergence, significant differences persist due to varying institutional frameworks, legal systems, and regulatory environments. Countries with civil law traditions often have accounting systems closely linked to tax regulations, which may not align with International Financial Reporting Standards principles (La Porta et al., 1998). This institutional misalignment can hinder full adoption and implementation. Gray (1988) and Hofstede (1980) emphasize that cultural values significantly influence accounting practices. For example, conservatism, secrecy, and individualism shape the way standards are interpreted and applied, contributing to divergence even after convergence at the technical level. The effectiveness of harmonization efforts depends not only on the adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards but also on the strength of enforcement mechanisms (Ahmed, Neel, & Wang, 2013). In many developing countries, including Nigeria, weak regulatory oversight and inadequate institutional capacity limit the benefits of convergence (Iyoha & Jimoh, 2011). Adopting or converging with International Financial Reporting Standards involves substantial transition costs, including staff retraining; IT upgrades, and changes in internal controls and auditing procedures. Resistance from stakeholders, especially in developing economies, can delay or dilute the adoption process (Zeff, 2007; Iyoha & Faboyede, 2011). There is broad consensus in the literature that harmonization and convergence efforts have significantly transformed global financial reporting over the past few decades. The widespread adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards, particularly in the European Union, parts of Asia, and emerging economies, signifies the growing influence of a unified financial reporting language (Zeff, 2012; Nobes & Parker, 2020). Empirical studies affirm the positive outcomes associated with IFRS, including increased transparency, reduced information asymmetry, and improved comparability of financial statements (Barth et al., 2008; Daske et al., 2008). However, the literature also reveals that the success of harmonization and convergence is conditional and uneven across jurisdictions. While some countries fully embrace International Financial Reporting Standards, others adopt it partially or selectively. Even among adopters, the quality of implementation varies significantly due to differences in regulatory capacity, legal traditions, audit quality, and cultural norms (Christensen et al., 2015; Albu & Albu, 2012). As such, convergence at the level of standards does not always translate into convergence in practice, creating a gap between *de jure* alignment and *de facto* application. Additionally, critics argue that International Financial Reporting Standards may not be universally suitable, especially for developing economies with weak institutions or alternative accounting traditions. The cost of implementation, lack of trained personnel, and incompatibility with local reporting needs have been cited as barriers to effective convergence (Zeghal & Mhedhbi, 2006; Ramanna & Sletten, 2014). These limitations suggest that while harmonization and convergence are theoretically appealing, their practical realization remains fraught with institutional and contextual challenges.

Enduring and Intentional Divergence

Despite global efforts toward standardization, divergence remains a persistent feature of the international accounting environment. This divergence is not merely a residual outcome of incomplete convergence but often an intentional response to local needs, values, and institutional structures (Nobes, 2006; Ding et al., 2007). National governments may prioritize domestic goals such as tax alignment, regulatory control, or political autonomy, thereby resisting full adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards or modifying its application. For instance, China's approach to convergence is strategic rather than absolute; it aligns national standards with International Financial Reporting Standards to a considerable extent while maintaining control over interpretation and enforcement (Peng & van der Laan Smith, 2010). Similarly, countries in the Middle East and Africa have demonstrated selective adoption patterns influenced by colonial legacies, religious values, and resource constraints (Tyrrall et al., 2007). Divergence also arises from structural differences in enforcement regimes. While some jurisdictions possess robust institutional infrastructures that support high-quality financial reporting, others lack effective oversight mechanisms, allowing for inconsistent implementation and enforcement of standards (Soderstrom & Sun, 2007). Thus, the existence of International Financial Reporting Standards does not ensure uniform global accounting practices; rather, it coexists with a mosaic of localized adaptations and resistances.

The Tension between Global Uniformity and Local Relevance

A central tension in the literature is the trade-off between global uniformity and local relevance. While International Financial Reporting Standards aims to serve the needs of global capital markets by promoting transparency and comparability, financial reporting is also embedded in local economic, legal, and social systems. Stakeholder theory reminds us that accounting serves multiple constituent's regulators, investors, tax authorities, employees, and the public each with different informational needs (Freeman, 1984; Albu et al., 2014). This tension suggests that convergence should not be viewed as an end in itself but as a means to improve reporting quality within appropriate institutional contexts. Some scholars advocate for a "contextualized convergence" model, where global standards are adapted to local realities without undermining their core principles (Judge et al., 2010). Such an approach balances the aspirations of global harmonization with the imperatives of national sovereignty and relevance.

Empirical Review

Barth et al. (2008) investigates whether the adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards improves accounting quality. Using a sample of firms that voluntarily adopted International Financial Reporting Standards compared to firms using domestic standards, the authors evaluate earnings quality through metrics such as value relevance and earnings smoothing. The study concludes that International Financial Reporting Standards adopters generally report higher-quality earnings, exhibit reduced earnings management, and display improved financial transparency. Voluntary adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards enhances financial reporting quality and comparability across borders. Promote voluntary International Financial Reporting Standards adoption alongside strong regulatory oversight. Encourage preparers to move beyond compliance and focus on substance. Support training programs that help firms align with the principles-based nature of International Financial Reporting Standards.

Ahmed et al. (2013) examines the impact of mandatory International Financial Reporting Standards adoption on accounting quality across various jurisdictions. Using data from countries that adopted International Financial Reporting Standards, the researchers analyze whether the quality improvements are directly attributable to International Financial Reporting Standards or to surrounding institutional factors. The results indicate that the improvement in accounting quality is not uniform across countries. Instead, the benefits of International Financial Reporting Standards depend heavily on a country's legal, institutional, and enforcement infrastructure. International Financial Reporting Standards alone does not guarantee higher accounting quality strong institutions and enforcement are critical. Focus on strengthening institutions and legal frameworks in International Financial Reporting Standards adopting countries, pair standard convergence with capacity building strategies. Monitor not just adoption but actual compliance with International Financial Reporting Standards principles.

Street and Gray (2001) investigates the level of compliance with International Accounting Standards among European companies and explores factors that contribute to non-compliance. The analysis draws from financial reports and disclosures from various firms across Europe. Despite formal adoption of International Accounting Standard, many firms were found to provide incomplete or inconsistent disclosures. The study attributes this to weak enforcement, varying national traditions, and insufficient guidance. There is a notable gap between formal harmonization and practical application, undermining the goal of uniform global reporting. Develop clear, enforceable guidelines to reduce discretionary interpretation. Strengthen national enforcement mechanisms to ensure consistent application. Promote external audits and oversight by international accounting bodies.

Ball et al. 2003) explores the relationship between financial reporting incentives and accounting outcomes in East Asian countries. The authors examine whether the formal convergence with international standards results in improved accounting quality. Despite convergence efforts, the study finds widespread earnings management and low transparency. It concludes that local economic and institutional incentives override the influence of accounting standards. Convergence with international standards does not automatically lead to better accounting practices local incentives and enforcement dominates outcomes. Align International Financial Reporting Standards adoption with reforms in enforcement and corporate governance. Tailor International Financial Reporting Standards implementation strategies to fit local institutional realities. Conduct regular post-implementation reviews to assess compliance behavior.

Iyoha and Faboyede (2011) explore the implications of International Financial Reporting Standards adoption in Nigeria, focusing on both the expected benefits and the practical challenges encountered. The authors use a combination of policy analysis and stakeholder insights to assess the country’s transition process. International Financial Reporting Standards adoption has improved financial reporting transparency and investor confidence. However, challenges such as inadequate training, poor infrastructure, and limited enforcement hinder full realization of these benefits. While International Financial Reporting Standards adoption in Nigeria is a step in the right direction, significant implementation gaps remain due to institutional weaknesses. Intensify International Financial Reporting Standards related training for preparers, auditors, and regulators. Develop national implementation roadmaps that consider local challenges. Foster public-private partnerships to fund accounting system upgrades.

Daske et al. (2008) investigates the economic impact of mandatory International Financial Reporting Standards adoption on market liquidity, cost of capital, and firm valuation across 26 countries. The authors use a dataset covering pre- and post- International Financial Reporting Standards adoption periods to assess changes in capital market outcomes. The results show that International Financial Reporting Standards adoption generally improves market liquidity and lowers firms' cost of capital, especially in countries with strong enforcement institutions and investor protection. International Financial Reporting Standards adoption positively affects capital markets, but the benefits are conditional on complementary legal and institutional frameworks. Strengthen investor protection laws to maximize the benefits of International Financial Reporting Standards. Focus on institutional readiness when designing convergence policies. Encourage post-adoption monitoring and enforcement to sustain market confidence.

Nobes and Stadler (2015) evaluate how managers make accounting policy choices under IFRS, with a focus on the qualitative characteristics of financial information. It examines whether convergence with International Financial Reporting Standards leads to improved decision-usefulness of financial statements. The authors find that although International Financial Reporting Standards provides flexibility in accounting choices, this can lead to managerial discretion that affects comparability and neutrality, especially in environments with weak governance. Convergence improves reporting quality in theory, but in practice, discretion under International Financial Reporting Standards can undermine consistency and transparency. Enhance corporate governance and internal controls to reduce opportunistic accounting behavior. Limit excessive flexibility in International Financial Reporting Standards where possible. Provide country-specific International Financial Reporting Standards guidance for consistent interpretation.

Chen et al. (2010) empirically assesses the effect of mandatory International Financial Reporting Standards adoption in 2005 on accounting quality among European Union firms. Using pre- and post-adoption data, it measures earnings management, timely loss recognition, and value relevance. The findings reveal moderate improvements in accounting quality after International Financial Reporting Standards adoption. However, the effects are stronger in countries with robust legal systems and enforcement. International Financial Reporting Standards adoption enhances accounting quality in supportive institutional contexts but has limited effects where enforcement is weak. Ensure IFRS adoption is accompanied by reforms in judicial and regulatory frameworks. Increase coordination between EU-level and national-level enforcement bodies. Encourage firm-level transparency through disclosure incentives and penalties.

Implications for Policy, Practice and Research

The ongoing coexistence of harmonization, convergence, and divergence has important implications. For policymakers, it underscores the need for flexible adoption strategies that consider institutional readiness and stakeholder needs. International standard setters like the International Accounting Standards Board must recognize the diversity of economic environments and offer guidance that accommodates different levels of capacity and development. For practitioners, the findings highlight the importance of professional judgment, continuous education, and ethical commitment in applying international standards across varied contexts. Regulators should invest in institutional strengthening to ensure that convergence efforts lead to substantive, not merely symbolic, outcomes. For researchers, the field remains fertile. More work is needed on International Financial Reporting Standards implementation in under-researched regions, such as Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. Future studies could also explore the long-term effects of convergence on firm performance, financial inclusion, and sustainability reporting. Interdisciplinary research combining accounting, political economy, and institutional theory can offer deeper insights into the evolving dynamics of global financial reporting.

Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design, specifically a descriptive and exploratory approach, relying primarily on an extensive literature review and analysis of secondary data sources. The design is suitable for synthesizing theoretical and empirical findings related to the harmonization, convergence, and divergence of accounting standards globally. Through this design, the study seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics, implications, and contextual factors shaping international accounting standard practices. The study is based on a systematic literature review of both theoretical and empirical works in the domain of international financial reporting. This approach enables the identification, evaluation, and interpretation of relevant research paper. The review incorporates a blend of: Peer-reviewed journal articles Official publications from standard-setting bodies (e.g., I ASB, FASB, IFAC), Professional reports (e.g., ACCA, World Bank, IMF), Textbooks and academic monographs**,** Research conference papers**.** The focus is to analyze patterns, themes, findings, and gaps across studies that examine the adoption, benefits, limitations, and enforcement of accounting standards, particularly International Financial Reporting Standards. All data used in this study are secondary in nature, drawn from credible academic and professional sources.

Conclusion

This literature synthesis has critically examined the global dynamics of harmonization, convergence, and divergence in accounting standards, revealing a complex and evolving landscape shaped by globalization, institutional diversity, and socio economic context. Harmonization and convergence have significantly improved the comparability, transparency, and credibility of financial statements across jurisdictions, the persistence of divergence underscores the influence of institutional, cultural, and regulatory differences among countries. The study concludes that achieving global uniformity in financial reporting requires more than the formal adoption of international standards; it necessitates robust enforcement mechanisms, strong institutional frameworks, and context-specific implementation strategies. Without addressing these foundational issues, the full benefits of International Financial Reporting Standards and global standardization may remain unrealized, particularly in developing economies. The harmonization of accounting standards initially focused on reducing differences laid the foundation for later convergence efforts spearheaded by the adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards across multiple jurisdictions. These efforts have contributed significantly to improving the comparability and transparency of financial reports in many parts of the world. However, the convergence process is far from complete or universally successful. Divergence, whether due to contextual limitations, institutional weaknesses, or intentional resistance, remains a key challenge. Some countries have adopted International Financial Reporting Standards in form, they continue to report financial information in ways influenced by their legal, cultural, and political environments. This divergence suggests that global accounting uniformity cannot be fully achieved without a deep understanding of local realities and without building the institutional capacities necessary to support meaningful reform. The co-existence of harmonization, convergence, and divergence calls for a nuanced and balanced approach to international accounting standardization one that values comparability and transparency but is also sensitive to national sovereignty, economic development levels, and stakeholder diversity. This emphasizes that international accounting reforms must go beyond mere adoption and address the practical and institutional challenges of implementation.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this literature synthesis on the harmonization, convergence, and divergence of accounting standards, the following practical and policy-oriented recommendations are made to stakeholders involved in international accounting standardization: Countries, particularly in developing and transitional economies, should ensure that appropriate institutional structures such as regulatory bodies, audit oversight agencies, and judicial systems are in place and functioning effectively before adopting International Financial Reporting Standards. Without strong enforcement mechanisms and regulatory support, the benefits of International Financial Reporting Standards adoption may remain largely symbolic and fail to translate into improved financial reporting quality. The successful implementation of International Financial Reporting Standards requires a skilled accounting workforce. National governments and professional accounting bodies should invest in continuous training and certification programs for accountants, auditors, regulators, and educators. Emphasis should be placed on practical International Financial Reporting Standards application, ethical standards, and professional judgment to ensure consistent interpretation across different industries and jurisdictions. Policy makers should aim to align national accounting regulations with international standards without compromising local priorities such as tax reporting, legal compliance, and socio-economic development goals. Where full

International Financial Reporting Standards adoption is not feasible, jurisdictions should consider phased or tailored implementation models that preserve essential national accounting functions while moving toward global best practices. Inclusive participation from a wide range of stakeholders including businesses, investors, regulators, tax authorities, educators, and civil society is essential in designing and implementing accounting reforms. Stakeholder consultations can help identify potential implementation challenges and ensure that adopted standards are both relevant and practical in the local context. Countries should supplement International Financial Reporting Standards adoption with national implementation guides that provide sector-specific interpretations, practical examples, and clarifications on ambiguous areas of the standards. These tools will help reduce inconsistencies in application and support smaller firms and public sector entities in navigating complex reporting requirements. Regular post-adoption monitoring and evaluation should be institutionalized to assess the actual impact of International Financial Reporting Standards on financial reporting, investor confidence, and business performance. Feedback from this process can inform adjustments in regulatory practices and capacity development strategies, ensuring that convergence efforts remain responsive and effective. Regional economic blocs (e.g., ECOWAS, ASEAN, EU) and international organizations (e.g., IFAC, IASB, World Bank) should enhance technical cooperation, resource sharing, and peer learning among member countries. Joint training initiatives, technical assistance, and regulatory benchmarking can accelerate convergence efforts while respecting local variations. Regulatory agencies and accounting firms should leverage digital platforms, software solutions, and automation tools to support International Financial Reporting Standards implementation and enforcement. Technology can improve compliance, enhance reporting accuracy, and facilitate real-time monitoring of financial disclosures.

References

Ahmed, A. S., Neel, M., & Wang, D. (2013). Does mandatory adoption of IFRS improve accounting quality? *Review of Accounting Studies, 18*(4), 1373–1406. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-013-9244-7

Albu, N., & Albu, C. N. (2012). International Financial Reporting Standards in an emerging economy: Lessons from Romania. *Australian Accounting Review*, 22(4), 341–352. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1835-2561.2012.00194.x

Albu, N., Albu, C. N., & Alexander, D. (2014). When global accounting standards meet the local context—Insights from an emerging economy. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 25(6), 489–510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2013.01.004

Armstrong, C. S., Barth, M. E., Jagolinzer, A. D., & Riedl, E. J. (2010). Market reaction to the adoption of IFRS in Europe. *The Accounting Review, 85*(1), 31–61. https://doi.org/10.2308/accr.2010.85.1.31

Ball, R. (2006). International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS): Pros and cons for investors. *Accounting and Business Research*, 36(sup1), 5–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2006.9730040

Ball, R., Robin, A., & Wu, J. S. (2003). Incentives versus standards: Properties of accounting income in four East Asian countries. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 36*(1–3), 235–270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2003.10.003

Barth, M. E., Landsman, W. R., & Lang, M. H. (2008). International accounting standards and accounting quality. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 46(3), 467–498. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679X.2008.00287.x

Barth, M. E., Landsman, W. R., & Lang, M. H. (2008). International accounting standards and accounting quality. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 46(3), 467–498. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679X.2008.00287.x

Beke, J. (2010). International accounting harmonization: Evidence from Europe. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, *9*(10), 99–106. https://doi.org/10.19030/iber.v9i10.634

Brown, P. (2011). International Financial Reporting Standards: What are the benefits? *Accounting and Business Research*, 41(3), 269–285. https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2011.569544

Brusca, I., Montesinos, V., & Chow, D. S. L. (2013). *Public sector accounting and auditing in Europe: The challenge of harmonization*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Camfferman, K., & Zeff, S. A. (2007). *Financial reporting and global capital markets: A history of the international accounting standards committee, 1973–2000*. Oxford University Press.

Camfferman, K., & Zeff, S. A. (2015). *Aiming for global accounting standards: The International Accounting Standards Board, 2001–2011*. Oxford University Press.

Chatfield, M. (1974). *A history of accounting thought*. Prentice-Hall.

Chen, H., Tang, Q., Jiang, Y., & Lin, Z. (2010). The impact of mandatory IFRS adoption on the accounting quality of EU firms. *European Accounting Review*, *19*(3), 451–472. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180903384624

Choi, F. D. S., & Meek, G. K. (2011). *International accounting* (7th ed.). Pearson.

Choi, F. D. S., & Meek, G. K. (2014). *International Accounting* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

Christensen, H. B., Lee, E., & Walker, M. (2008). Incentives or standards: What determines accounting quality changes around IFRS adoption? *European Accounting Review*, 17(3), 467–498. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180802016642

Daske, H., Hail, L., Leuz, C., & Verdi, R. (2008). Mandatory IFRS reporting around the world: Early evidence on the economic consequences. *Journal of Accounting Research, 46*(5), 1085–1142. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679X.2008.00306.x

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

Ding, Y., Hope, O. K., Jeanjean, T., & Stolowy, H. (2007). Differences between domestic accounting standards and IAS: Measurement, determinants and implications. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 26(1), 1–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaccpubpol.2006.11.001

FASB (1978). *Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts No. 1: Objectives of Financial Reporting by Business Enterprises*. Financial Accounting Standards Board.

Financial Accounting Standards Board & International Accounting Standards Board (2002). *Memorandum of Understanding: The Norwalk Agreement*. Norwalk, CT: FASB.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.

Gray, S. J. (1988). Towards a theory of cultural influence on the development of accounting systems internationally. *Abacus*, 24(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6281.1988.tb00200.x

Hail, L., Leuz, C., & Wysocki, P. (2010). Global accounting convergence and the potential adoption of IFRS by the U.S. *Accounting Horizons*, *24*(3), 355–394. https://doi.org/10.2308/acch.2010.24.3.355

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage Publications.

IASB (2001). *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*. International Accounting Standards Board.

IFRS Foundation (2021). *Establishment of the International Sustainability Standards Board*. https://www.ifrs.org

International Financial Reporting Standards Foundation (2023). *Use of IFRS Standards around the world*. https://www.ifrs.org/use-around-the-world

Iyoha, F. O., & Faboyede, S. O. (2011). Adopting international financial reporting standards (IFRS) in Africa: Benefits, prospects and challenges. *African Research Review, 5*(3), 125–143. https://doi.org/10.4314/afrrev.v5i3.67339

Iyoha, F. O., & Jimoh, J. K. (2011). Institutional infrastructure and the adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards in Nigeria. *School of Doctoral Studies (European Union) Journal*, 6–17.

Judge, W. Q., Li, S., & Pinsker, R. (2010). National adoption of international accounting standards: An institutional perspective. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, *18*(3), 161–174. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8683.2010.00798.x

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (1998). Law and finance. *Journal of Political Economy*, *106*(6), 1113–1155. https://doi.org/10.1086/250042

Mattessich, R. (2000). *The Beginnings of Accounting and Accounting Thought: Accounting Practice in the Middle East (8000 B.C. to 2000 B.C.) and Accounting Thought in India (300 B.C. and the Middle Ages)*. Garland Publishing.

Murphy, A. B. (2000). The impact of adopting international accounting standards on the harmonization of accounting practices. *The International Journal of Accounting*, 35(4), 471–493. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7063(00)00076-1

Napier, C. (1996). "Accounting and the Law: The Case of the Joint Stock Companies Acts." *Accounting History*, 1(1), 51–78.

Nobes, C. (1998). Towards a general model of the reasons for international differences in financial reporting. *Abacus, 34*(2), 162–187. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6281.00028

Nobes, C. (2006). The survival of international differences under IFRS: Towards a research agenda. *Accounting and Business Research*, 36(3), 233–245. https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2006.9730023

Nobes, C., & Parker, R. (2020). *Comparative international accounting* (14th ed.). Pearson Education.

Nobes, C., & Stadler, C. (2015). The qualitative characteristics of financial information, and managers' accounting decisions: Evidence from IFRS policy changes. *Accounting and Business Research*, *45*(5), 572–601. https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2015.1048773

Pacioli, L. (1494). *Summa de Arithmetica, Geometria, Proportioni et Proportionalità*. Venice: Paganini.

Peng, S., & van der Laan Smith, J. (2010). Chinese GAAP and IFRS: An analysis of the convergence process. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, *19*(1), 16–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intaccaudtax.2009.12.002

Ramanna, K., & Sletten, E. (2014). Why do countries adopt International Financial Reporting Standards? *The Accounting Review*, *89*(4), 1493–1530. https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-50731

Samuels, J. M., & Piper, A. G. (1985). *International accounting: A survey*. Croom Helm.

Schipper, K. (2005). "The Introduction of International Accounting Standards in Europe: Implications for International Convergence." *European Accounting Review*, 14(1), 101–126.

Schroeder, R. G., Clark, M. W., & Cathey, J. M. (2019). *Financial accounting theory and analysis: Text and cases* (12th ed.). Wiley.

Soderstrom, N. S., & Sun, K. J. (2007). IFRS adoption and accounting quality: A review. *European Accounting Review*, *16*(4), 675–702. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180701706732

Street, D. L., & Gray, S. J. (2001). Observance of international accounting standards: Factors explaining non-compliance. *ACCA Research Report No. 74*.

Tay, J. S. W., & Parker, R. H. (1990). Measuring international harmonization and standardization. *Abacus*, 26(1), 71–88. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6281.1990.tb00227.x

Tsamenyi, M., Cullen, J., & González, J. M. G. (2006). Changes in accounting and financial information system in a Spanish electricity company: A new institutional theory analysis. *Management Accounting Research*, *17*(4), 409–432. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2006.02.002

Zeff, S. A. (2003). "How the U.S. Accounting Profession Got Where It Is Today: Part I." *Accounting Horizons*, 17(3), 189–205.

Zeff, S. A. (2007). "The Evolution of the IASC into the IASB, and the Challenges it Faces." *The Accounting Review*, 82(3), 807–837.

Zeff, S. A. (2007). Some obstacles to global financial reporting comparability and convergence at a high level of quality. *The British Accounting Review*, *39*(4), 290–302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2007.08.003

Zeff, S. A. (2012). The evolution of the IASC into the IASB, and the challenges it faces. *The Accounting Review*, 87(3), 807–837. https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-10246

Zeghal, D., & Mhedhbi, K. (2006). An analysis of the factors affecting the adoption of international accounting standards by developing countries. *The International Journal of Accounting*, 41(4), 373–386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intacc.2006.09.009