

in the field of accounting against knowledge management. It's describing the status quo of accounting model and arguing how far is accounting from knowledge. The key purpose of this paper is to introduce set of the urgent research questions related to accounting against knowledge management. The research question remains: is current accounting model mature enough to account for knowledge? An open question is: do we have a theory of accounting against knowledge? If so, how much perfect this model? Could the lacks of knowledge necessities be explained by inadequacy of accounting practices, or unique characteristics of knowledge practices? What is required to overcoming the paradoxes associated with accounting against knowledge management? These questions cannot be answered by the current ignorance and weak understanding of knowledge management. This paper adopts the structural components analysis methodology to attempt answering those questions and to draw a proposed accounting ontology against knowledge. These structural components are acting as important measures to gauge the availability of existed accounting model to measure and report knowledge business initiatives. This paper contributes to the existing accounting research in several ways: First, it contributes to improve understanding of the current situation of accounting against knowledge management assumptions. Second, paradoxes and lacks identified in this study provide insights into the recognition and reporting problems of accounting model. These identified problems could be considered by various stakeholders, regulators, and standards-setting bodies as they may seek to improve accounting against knowledge. Third, the lacks and critics identified illustrate what required to re-structuring a new accounting rules and practices to match knowledge necessities. Finally, this longitudinal analysis may contribute

to framework a new conceptual theory of accounting for knowledge management. To put this research paper into context, first both the nexuses of knowledge management theory and the realities of accounting model have been discussed. Further, in-depth overviews of the paradoxes and lacks of accounting model have been summarized. Finally, the proposed structure of meta-theory of accounting against knowledge management has been presented.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURES

2.1 Understanding knowledge management nexuses

Knowledge-based economy is a reality. Its unique dynamics, relationships, and assumptions have set the basics of a new growth theory (OECD, 1996). The new economic game incorporates the role of both knowledge and technology in driving productivity and economic growth (Corrado et. al, 2006). The emergence of knowledge-based economy has laid the foundation stone of an effective management of knowledge. Knowledge is not just another resource like labor and capital, but is the only important resource. Knowledge management is a new technology rather than any specific new science or invention (Drucker 1985). Knowledge management is one of three practices that have brought the most unexperienced turns to business (Prusak, 2001). The essence of knowledge management is to connect technology, process, and people to leverage value creation (Omotayo, 2015). Knowledge management is a value based rather than value chain; customer success based nor customer satisfaction; collaborative based not competitive (Amidon, 2003). As consequence, new ways of doing business associated with new business rules have been invented. However, development of knowledge-based performance has established new rules for gauging business