The Plausibility Trap

What Happened When British Accountants Became Professional Undoers of Confident Nonsense

Part One: The Year Everything Sounded Right

"The problem with the world is that the intelligent people are full of doubts, while the stupid ones are full of confidence."

— Charles Bukowski

"It is so painful because at first glance the information appears credible."

— UK Accountant, 2025

ONE

The Document

Sarah has a rule: if a document arrives already neatly formatted, she reads it twice.

This one came in at 8:47 on a Monday morning in February 2025, fourteen pages long, with headings, bullet points, and the kind of confident citations that make you think the writer has done this before. The client's message was cheerful. He'd been 'doing some research' about restructuring his business. He'd found a way to avoid paying tax on his property income by setting up a trust in Jersey and routing everything through there. He'd attached the full plan. Could she implement it by the end of the month?

Sarah made tea. She opened the attachment. And she felt the peculiar sensation of being outsmarted by something that didn't understand what it was saying.

The document wasn't wrong in the way people are usually wrong. It was wrong in the way a conjurer is honest: everything looked real, and none of it was. The formatting was impeccable. The tone was measured and professional. There were footnotes. There were references to HMRC guidance. There was even a section on 'compliance considerations' that read like something a cautious solicitor might write.

On page seven, she found it: a citation to 'HMRC Manual TSEM4660: Offshore Trust Structures and UK Tax Residency.' The reference number looked right. The formatting was correct. It even followed the exact citation style that HMRC uses in their published

guidance. Sarah had been working with HMRC manuals for fifteen years. She almost didn't check.

But she checked. TSEM4660 does not exist. There is no such manual section. The AI had invented an authoritative source and dressed it in the precise costume of legitimacy—a costume so accurate that it could only have been sewn by a machine that had studied thousands of real citations without understanding what any of them meant.

That fake reference number would stay with Sarah for the rest of the year. She would see variations of it again and again: invented case law, phantom legislation, confident citations to guidance that had been withdrawn or never written. Each one formatted perfectly. Each one wrong.

• • •

Sarah had been an accountant for fifteen years. In that time, she had heard bad advice from every conceivable source. Dave down the pub who 'definitely knew' you could claim your dog as a business expense. An uncle who'd read something in the Daily Mail. A bloke at the gym who'd sorted his own taxes for years, never had a problem.

The thing about Dave down the pub is that he sounds like Dave down the pub. There's a useful signal in his delivery—the beery confidence, the vague hand-waving, the way he changes the subject when you ask for specifics. You know, on some level, that you're not talking to an expert.

What arrived in Sarah's inbox that Monday morning was different. It didn't sound like Dave. It sounded like a tax barrister. It had the linguistic fingerprints of expertise: the hedged qualifications, the technical vocabulary, the confident-but-not-arrogant tone that professionals use when they know what they're talking about.

Except it didn't know what it was talking about. It had simply learned to sound like it did.

This is what Sarah would later describe as 'the plausibility trap'—and it would become the defining experience of her profession in 2025. The trap works like this: fluency is not the same as truth, but we are wired to treat them as if they were. A confident answer feels more reliable than a hesitant one. A well-formatted document seems more trustworthy than a messy one. A message that uses the right vocabulary sounds more credible than one that doesn't.

These are reasonable shortcuts. For most of human history, they've served us well. People who sound like experts usually are experts. Documents that look professional usually are professional. Fluency and truth have travelled together for so long that we've stopped noticing they're separate passengers.

And then, quite suddenly, they weren't. In 2025, accountants discovered what it meant to live in a world where fluency had learned to travel alone.

> *This is not a story about artificial intelligence. It is a story about what happens when confidence and truth come apart—and who pays the price when they do.*

TWO

The Debunking Tax

It took Sarah four hours to dismantle the fourteen-page tax plan her client had sent her.

Four hours of gathering evidence. Four hours of cross-referencing actual legislation. Four hours of writing careful, professional explanations for why each element of the plan was either illegal, outdated, or simply invented. Four hours she could not bill for—because her client hadn't asked her to do this work. He had asked her to implement a plan. She had chosen, instead, to save him from it.

By the end, the client was apologetic. 'It just sounded so... right,' he said.

Sarah was polite. But she had begun to notice something that would define her year: she was no longer being paid to do accounting. She was being paid to do verification. And verification, it turns out, is a tax that only the careful have to pay.

• • •

Economists have a term for costs that aren't borne by the people who create them: externalities. Pollution is an externality. Traffic congestion is an externality. And in 2025, British accountants discovered a new one.

> *Call it the debunking tax. It works like this: a machine produces a confident, plausible-sounding answer in seconds. A human spends hours proving it wrong. The machine's creator captures the value of speed. The human absorbs the cost of accuracy. And the system that produced the error doesn't learn from the correction—it will give the same wrong answer to the next person who asks.*

This is not just an accounting problem. It is an incentive distortion that threatens any profession where being right matters more than sounding right. Lawyers face it. Doctors face it. Journalists face it. Anyone whose job involves distinguishing truth from plausibility is now subsidising the machines that can't tell the difference.

In late 2025, the accounting software firm Dext surveyed five hundred UK accountants. The numbers confirmed what practitioners already knew: half of the accountants surveyed knew of businesses that had suffered direct financial losses from following AI-generated advice. Nearly a third encountered AI-caused errors on a weekly basis. And ninety-three percent of those who dealt with such errors reported spending additional unpaid hours correcting them—typically three to ten hours per month, per accountant.

Those hours have to come from somewhere. They come from evenings and weekends. They come from other clients whose work gets delayed. They come from the accountant's own wellbeing. And they come, increasingly, from the profession's willingness to keep doing a job that has become a Sisyphean exercise in pushing back against confident nonsense.

• • •

One accountant, speaking to the trade publication AccountingWEB, captured the exhaustion perfectly: 'I felt like I was repeating myself. Then I realised that it was AI that I was arguing with.'

Her name was Ria-Jaine Lincoln, and her experience had become distressingly common. A client would send a query. The query would be articulate, well-researched, and completely wrong. She would respond with the correct information. The client would push back—not because they doubted her expertise, but because their AI had already told them something different, and the AI had sounded very confident indeed.

'AI is telling me it's okay,' they would say. And Lincoln would find herself in the strange position of arguing not with her client, but with a machine that wasn't in the room and couldn't hear her anyway.

The debunking tax falls entirely on the person who is right. The person who is wrong pays nothing. And the system that made them wrong keeps running, keeps generating, keeps sounding confident.

This is how trust breaks in an attention economy: not through malice, but through a market that rewards speed over accuracy and confidence over competence. The machines aren't lying. They're just fluent. And fluency, in 2025, had learned to travel alone.

THREE

The Man Who Was Replaced by a Feeling

In April 2025, a Reddit post appeared in the accounting forums with the kind of title that makes you stop scrolling: 'ChatGPT is going to make me end it.'

The author wasn't suicidal. He was exhausted. His story would become one of the most-discussed threads in accounting communities that year, because it captured something that statistics alone could not: the particular misery of being right and being ignored.

We'll call him Marcus. He worked as the sole finance professional at a small company—no CFO, no team, just him and his spreadsheets and fifteen years of hard-won expertise. And then there was his CEO.

'He likes it because it's fast,' Marcus wrote. 'He can get immediate answers. But they're not accurate. I'm so over my boss saying "ChatGPT says..." It's not a source of truth.'

The pattern was always the same. Marcus would analyse a situation, prepare recommendations, present them in a meeting—only for his CEO to wave a hand and say, 'But ChatGPT says we should do it differently.'

The CEO wasn't being malicious. He genuinely believed the AI. And why wouldn't he? It was fast. It was available at 3 a.m. It never pushed back or said 'it's complicated.' It never asked for more time. It gave clean, confident answers in the exact tone of voice that busy

executives want to hear.

Marcus, with his nuanced explanations and professional caveats, suddenly seemed like the obstacle.

> *This is perhaps the cruellest irony of the plausibility trap. The very things that make an expert valuable—the ability to see complications, to hedge appropriately, to say 'it depends'—are the things that make them seem less confident than a machine that has no idea what it doesn't know.*

The comments section of Marcus's post became a support group. Hundreds of finance professionals recognised themselves in his story:

'Same here. My manager sends me ChatGPT outputs to "verify." They're usually wrong.'

'The worst part is when you correct them and they look at you like YOU'RE the one who doesn't understand.'

'I've started keeping a folder of every time ChatGPT gave my boss bad advice. It's getting pretty thick.'

Marcus eventually started job hunting. Not because he hated his work, but because he couldn't see a future where his expertise would be valued over the feeling of certainty that the machine provided. He wasn't replaced by AI. He was replaced by a feeling.

And this is where the debunking tax becomes something darker than an economic inefficiency. It becomes a social fact. In rooms where speed is rewarded, confidence beats competence. In cultures that

value certainty, the person who says 'it's complicated' loses to the machine that says 'here's your answer.' The expert who hedges is less persuasive than the algorithm that doesn't know how to hedge.

The market doesn't just fail to reward accuracy. It actively punishes it.

FOUR

The Confidence Gap

In 2018, a man in Vermont followed his GPS down a boat ramp and drove into Lake Champlain. The GPS had told him to turn right. He turned right. It was, the GPS assured him, the fastest route to his destination.

He was not stupid. He was, by all accounts, a competent adult with a functional automobile. But he was also tired, it was dark, and the machine spoke with such confidence that he stopped trusting his own eyes.

Psychologists call this 'automation bias': the tendency to trust automated systems even when they contradict our own perceptions or expertise. It's been documented in pilots who follow instruments into mountains, doctors who accept incorrect dosage recommendations, and drivers who end up in lakes. The pattern is always the same: the machine sounds certain, the human feels uncertain, and certainty wins.

What happened in UK accounting in 2025 was automation bias at scale. The machines weren't giving directions. They were giving tax advice. And they were giving it with a confidence that no human expert would dare to match—because human experts know what they don't know, and these machines did not.

• • •

The problem with large language models—the technology behind ChatGPT and its competitors—is that they have no internal sense of uncertainty. They cannot distinguish between a fact they've learned and a plausible-sounding sentence they've invented. They simply predict the next word that's most likely to appear, and they do this with exactly the same fluency whether the prediction is accurate or completely fabricated.

Stuart Cobbe, who tested ChatGPT on professional accounting exams for the ICAEW, captured the problem precisely: 'ChatGPT gives answers with an air of confidence even when it's completely wrong. It's not afraid to give a garbage answer and back it up with garbage.'

> *This is the confidence gap: the distance between what a system knows and how certain it sounds. For humans, that gap is usually small. We hedge when we're uncertain. We admit ignorance. We use phrases like 'I think' and 'probably' and 'it depends.' For AI, the gap can be enormous—because the system has no mechanism for recognising when it's out of its depth.*

The examples from 2025 were sometimes comical, sometimes costly. ChatGPT confidently cited the UK VAT registration threshold as £85,000 months after it had risen to £90,000. It invented Making Tax Digital deadlines. It referenced legislation that had been repealed and guidance that had never existed. One practitioner found that an AI-generated financial model kept producing balance sheets that didn't balance—assets didn't equal liabilities—because the machine had no concept of what a balance sheet was supposed

to do.

'LLMs don't understand accounting,' one Reddit user explained, in a post that would be widely shared. 'They don't reconcile or question whether the numbers make sense. They just output the most statistically likely response.'

The most statistically likely response. That phrase captures something essential about the plausibility trap. The AI isn't trying to be right. It's trying to sound right. And in a world where fluency and truth have always travelled together, sounding right is usually enough.

Until it isn't.

FIVE

The Other Side of the Trap

Here is the mystery at the heart of this story: if AI was causing so much damage, why did ninety-one percent of UK accountants report using it or planning to use it? Why did nearly half report measurable productivity gains? Why, by late 2025, had AI adoption in British accounting become nearly universal?

The answer lies in the distinction that Sarah intuited on that Monday morning in February, and that the profession spent the rest of the year learning the hard way: fluency is not truth, but there are places where fluency is all you need.

• • •

Consider email. The most popular use of AI among accountants—reported by nearly sixty percent—was composing client communications. One practitioner explained: 'I have it rewrite a lot of the things I write. If my first stab is too terse, I'll have it rewrite it in a more friendly tone.'

This is low-risk AI at its best. Nobody's business collapses because an email is ten percent more polished than it needs to be. The AI is being asked to produce fluency, not truth. And fluency is exactly what it's good at.

Or consider bank reconciliation. Modern accounting software can now auto-match the vast majority of bank transactions to their

corresponding entries. This isn't about truth—it's about pattern recognition, matching this kind of transaction to that kind of category based on rules the system has learned. The AI doesn't need to understand accounting. It just needs to recognise patterns.

The accountants who thrived in 2025 were the ones who understood this distinction intuitively. They used AI for tasks where fluency mattered and truth didn't: drafting communications, processing receipts, auto-categorising transactions, generating first drafts of routine documents. And they kept AI away from tasks where truth was essential: tax calculations, compliance decisions, anything that would be relied upon without human verification.

> *Use AI to accelerate. Never use AI to decide.*

One practitioner described their research workflow: 'I write very specific questions which include ChatGPT required to give references and links. I save tons of time—HMRC manuals, specific clauses, court cases for context. Much more than googling, and I can get answers in minutes rather than hours.'

Then came the crucial caveat: 'You still have to read the tax stuff and understand.'

This was the golden rule of 2025. AI could find information. It could draft documents. It could match patterns and smooth prose and accelerate the tedious parts of the job. What it could not do—what it may never be able to do—is take responsibility for being right.

That responsibility remained stubbornly, irreducibly human.

SIX

The Weight of Everything Else

There is a temptation, when telling a story about technology, to make technology the whole story. But the accountants who lived through 2025 would tell you that AI was only one weight on a scale that was already tipping.

Three quarters of UK chartered accountants reported burnout symptoms that year. A third experienced insomnia. A similar proportion were dealing with depression. Four in ten were considering leaving the profession entirely.

The causes were multiple and mostly not about AI. There was HMRC, which had become so understaffed that taxpayers collectively spent centuries on hold. There was Making Tax Digital, the looming compliance change that eight in ten accountants cited as their top concern. There was a talent shortage so severe that three quarters of firms reported they couldn't take on new clients.

Into this environment came AI: a technology that promised to ease the burden and, in some ways, did. But also a technology that created new burdens—new errors to correct, new client expectations to manage, new arguments to have with bosses who preferred the machine's confidence to the human's caution.

The debunking tax doesn't exist in a vacuum. It lands on professionals who are already stretched. It takes hours from people who don't have hours to spare. It adds complexity to jobs that were already complex.

And it does all this invisibly, because the cost is absorbed by individuals rather than appearing on any balance sheet.

• • •

This is perhaps the deepest problem with the debunking tax: it is a cost that the market cannot see. When an accountant spends four hours correcting a client's AI-generated tax plan, that time doesn't show up anywhere. The client doesn't pay extra for it. The firm often can't bill for it. The profession's aggregate productivity statistics don't capture it.

What the market sees is the AI: fast, cheap, confident, always available. What the market doesn't see is the human picking up the pieces: slow, expensive, uncertain, burning out.

This asymmetry is how trust erodes in an economy. The visible benefits accrue to the technology. The invisible costs accrue to the professionals. And because the costs are invisible, the market keeps pushing toward more technology and fewer professionals—right up until something breaks badly enough that everyone finally notices.

SEVEN

What They Learned

By December 2025, something like a consensus had emerged among UK accountants. Not a consensus that AI was good or bad—the evidence was too mixed for that—but a practical wisdom about how to navigate the plausibility trap without falling in.

The lessons were simple to state and difficult to follow.

First: keep a human in the loop for anything that matters. AI could draft, suggest, accelerate—but it could never be the final word on anything where being wrong had consequences.

Second: match the tool to the task. Use AI for fluency. Never use it for truth. The moment you ask a language model to be right rather than to sound right, you've stepped into the trap.

Third: educate clients before the problems arrive. Some practitioners had begun creating 'AI usage policies' for their clients, setting expectations early about what the technology could and couldn't do. The conversations that happened before the fourteen-page tax plan were much easier than the conversations that happened after.

Fourth: train your people. Over half of firms provided no formal AI training, and they were paying the price in errors and inefficiency. The accountants who used AI well were the ones who had learned, through trial and error or formal instruction, where the boundaries were.

But the deepest lesson was about something larger than technology. It was about what accountants had always done, and why it still mattered.

• • •

A Reddit user, in one of the many threads about AI that year, offered a summary that was widely shared: 'I'm not worried AI will take my job. I'm more worried about the people who blindly trust it.'

This was the real discovery of 2025. The threat wasn't the machine. The threat was the gap between the machine's confidence and the human's willingness to question it. Close that gap, and AI became a tool. Leave it open, and AI became a trapdoor.

The accountants who understood this were not the ones who rejected AI. They were the ones who had learned to distrust confidence without competence—whether it came from a chatbot, a CEO, or Dave down the pub.

EPILOGUE

The Undoers

In the end, 2025 didn't answer the question everyone had been asking. It didn't tell us whether AI would replace accountants. Instead, it revealed something more interesting: AI had created a new kind of work that only accountants could do.

Not the old work of adding numbers and filing returns—though that remained. Something else. The work of verification. The work of translation. The work of standing between a confident machine and a client who wants to believe it. The work of being right, carefully and expensively, in a world that increasingly rewards being fast.

Sarah, the accountant who opened this story, had a phrase for what her job had become. 'Professional undoers of plausible nonsense,' she called it. She said it wryly, but she meant it seriously.

The plausibility trap had not closed. If anything, it had widened. More AI tools were coming. More clients would use them. More confident-sounding documents would land in inboxes at 8:47 on Monday mornings, citing HMRC Manual TSEM4660 and other authorities that had never existed.

But something else had happened too. The profession that spent 2025 complaining about AI had also spent 2025 discovering why it still existed. The technology that was supposed to replace human judgment had instead revealed how irreplaceable human judgment was.

A chatbot can generate a tax plan in seconds. It takes a human to understand that the plan is built on sand.

A machine can write a confident answer about legislation. It takes a professional to know that the legislation changed three months ago.

An algorithm can produce a document that looks exactly like expert advice. It takes an expert to spot TSEM4660—the reference number that looks so right and means nothing at all.

> *In 2025, accountants didn't get replaced by AI. They got recruited to fight it. And in that fight, they rediscovered something that had been true all along: the most valuable skill in an age of confident machines is the willingness to say, 'Actually, that's wrong.'*

The debunking tax is real, and someone has to pay it. In 2025, that someone was the accountant who checked. The accountant who questioned. The accountant who refused to let fluency stand in for truth.

It's exhausting work. It's often thankless work. It's work that doesn't scale, in an economy that worships scale above all else.

But it's necessary work. And for now, at least, it's human work.

The robots came to the office. And what they taught us, more than anything, was how much we still need people who can tell the difference between sounding right and being right.

Part Two

What's Coming in 2026

The story continues. Making Tax Digital arrives. The regulatory reckoning approaches. New tools promise new efficiencies—and new traps.

The accountants who survived 2025 share what they're doing differently.

Coming Soon

SOURCES

Notes and References

This book draws on surveys, forum discussions, and first-hand accounts from UK accounting professionals in 2024-2025.

The Dext survey of 500 UK accountants (December 2025) documented AI-related errors, client behaviour, and financial losses. The finding that half of accountants knew of businesses suffering direct financial losses from AI-generated advice, and that ninety-three percent of those encountering errors spent additional unpaid hours correcting them, comes from this survey.

AccountingWEB forum discussions provided practitioner perspectives throughout the year, including the Ria-Jaine Lincoln quote that became one of their 'Quotes of the Year.' The Reddit r/Accounting community was the source for Marcus's story.

Stuart Cobbe's testing of ChatGPT on ICAEW professional exams was published by the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales. The Wolters Kluwer survey provided the ninety-one percent adoption figure. CABA's wellbeing research documented burnout rates among chartered accountants.

The fake HMRC reference 'TSEM4660' is a fictional example created to illustrate the documented pattern of AI-generated citations that mimic authentic formatting while referencing non-existent sources.

Sarah and Marcus are composite characters. Their experiences are drawn from multiple documented accounts.