**МРНТИ** 06.81.35
**УДК** 657.1:001.895

**DOI** 10.58319/26170493_2025_3_34

# INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL IN THE DIGITAL ECONOMY: INNOVATIONS IN ASSESSING AND MANAGING COMPANY VALUE

**CHEN L.**[1*]
**2nd year Doctoral Student, China, DBA**
**DOSZHAN R.**[1]
**Candidate of Economic Sciences**
**ZHUSSUPOVA ZH.**[2]
**MBA, Senior Lecturer**

[1]Al-Farabi business school, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
[2]K. Sagadiev University of International Business, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

**ABSTRACT.** In the era of the digital and knowledge-based economy, traditional financial models that prioritize tangible assets are becoming less relevant. Intellectual capital, a collection of intangible assets encompassing human, organizational, and relational resources, is emerging as the primary source of competitive advantage and a catalyst for market capitalization growth in contemporary enterprises.

However, the current accounting standards, such as IFRS and GAAP, fall short in accurately reflecting the value of internally generated intellectual capital, resulting in a substantial discrepancy between the book value and the market value of companies.

This article delves into a comprehensive examination of innovative financial management strategies aimed at addressing the challenge of measuring and managing intellectual capital. The paper systematically explores a range of approaches, from non-financial metrics like the Balanced Scorecard to sophisticated financial models, including the Intellectual Capital Value Added Coefficient (VAIC). The concept of integrated reporting (IR) is receiving significant attention as a transformative approach to corporate communication about value creation. Through the examination of hypothetical data from prominent technology companies, a comparative evaluation of the efficacy of various IR measurement frameworks is conducted. The article demonstrates that the emphasis in financial management is shifting from a mere declaration of value to proactive management of intangible drivers, with the goal of fostering sustainable long-term growth.

**KEYWORDS:** Intellectual capital, intangible assets, financial management, value measurement, VAIC, integrated reporting, valuation gap, human capital, structural capital, innovation.

# ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛЬНЫЙ КАПИТАЛ В ЦИФРОВОЙ ЭКОНОМИКЕ: ИННОВАЦИИ В ОЦЕНКЕ СТОИМОСТИ КОМПАНИИ И УПРАВЛЕНИИ ЕЮ

**CHEN L.**[1*]
**докторант 2-го года обучения, КНР, DBA**
**ДОСЖАН Р.**[1]
**кандидат экономических наук**
**ЖУСУПОВА Ж.М.**[2]
**MBA, старший преподаватель**

[1]Бизнес-школа «Аль-Фараби», Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан.
[2]Университет международного бизнеса имени К. Сагадиева, Алматы, Казахстан.

**АННОТАЦИЯ.** В эпоху цифровой экономики, основанной на знаниях, традиционные финансовые модели, в которых приоритет отдается материальным активам, становятся менее актуальными. Интеллектуальный капитал, совокупность нематериальных активов, включающих человеческие, организационные ресурсы и ресурсы взаимоотношений, становится основным источником конкурентных преимуществ и катализатором роста рыночной капитализации современных предприятий. Однако действующие стандарты бухгалтерского учета, такие как МСФО и ОПБУ, не позволяют точно отразить стоимость интеллектуального капитала, соз-

данного собственными силами, что приводит к существенному расхождению между балансовой и рыночной стоимостью компаний. В этой статье подробно рассматриваются инновационные стратегии финансового менеджмента, направленные на решение проблемы измерения интеллектуального капитала и управления им. В статье систематически исследуется целый ряд подходов, от нефинансовых показателей, таких как Сбалансированная система показателей, до сложных финансовых моделей, включая коэффициент добавленной стоимости интеллектуального капитала (VAIC). Концепции интегрированной отчетности (IR) уделяется значительное внимание как преобразующему подходу к корпоративной коммуникации, направленной на создание ценности. На основе анализа гипотетических данных, полученных от ведущих технологических компаний, проводится сравнительная оценка эффективности различных систем измерения IR. В статье показано, что акцент в финансовом менеджменте смещается с простого декларирования ценности на активное управление нематериальными факторами с целью содействия устойчивому долгосрочному росту.

**КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА:** Интеллектуальный капитал, нематериальные активы, финансовый менеджмент, измерение стоимости, VAIC, интегрированная отчетность, пробелы в оценке, человеческий капитал, структурный капитал, инновации.

# ЦИФРЛЫҚ ЭКОНОМИКАДАҒЫ ЗИЯТКЕРЛІК КАПИТАЛ: КОМПАНИЯ ҚҰНЫН БАҒАЛАУ МЕН БАСҚАРУДАҒЫ ИННОВАЦИЯЛАР

**CHEN L.[1*]**
**2 курс докторанты, ҚХР, DBA**
**ДОСЖАН Р.[1]**
**экономика ғылымдарының докторы**
**ЖУСУПОВА Ж.М.[2]**
**MBA, аға оқытушы**

[1]Әл-Фараби атындағы ҚазҰУ, әл-Фараби бизнес мектебі, Алматы, Қазақстан.
[2]Қ. Сағадиев атындағы Халықаралық бизнес университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан.

**АҢДАТПА.** Цифрлық және білімге негізделген экономика дәуірінде материалдық активтерге басымдық беретін дәстүрлі қаржылық модельдердің өзектілігі азайып барады. Зияткерлік капитал, адами, ұйымдастырушылық және реляциялық ресурстарды қамтитын материалдық емес активтер жиынтығы бәсекелестік артықшылықтың негізгі көзі және қазіргі заманғы кәсіпорындарда нарықтық капиталдандырудың өсуінің катализаторы ретінде пайда болады. Алайда, IFRS және GAAP сияқты қолданыстағы бухгалтерлік есеп стандарттары ішкі өндірілген зияткерлік капиталдың құнын дәл көрсете алмайды, бұл компаниялардың баланстық құны мен нарықтық құны арасында айтарлықтай сәйкессіздікке әкеледі. Бұл мақалада зияткерлік капиталды өлшеу және басқару мәселелерін шешуге бағытталған қаржылық менеджменттің инновациялық стратегияларын жан-жақты зерттеу қарастырылған. Мақалада теңдестірілген үөрсеткіштер жүйесі сияқты қаржылық емес көрсеткіштерден бастап үүрделі қаржылық модельдерге, соның ішінде қосылған құнның зияткерлік капитал коэффициентіне (VAIC) дейінгі бірқатар тәсілдер жүйелі түрде қарастырылады. Интеграцияланған есептілік (IR) тұжырымдамасы құндылықты құру туралы корпоративтік коммуникацияға трансформациялық тәсіл ретінде айтарлықтай назар аударады. Көрнекті технологиялық компаниялардың гипотетикалық деректерін зерттеу арқылы әр түрлі өлшеу шеңберлерінің тиімділігіне салыстырмалы бағалау жүргізіледі. Мақалада қаржылық менеджменттегі басты назар тұрақты ұзақ мерзімді өсуді ынталандыру мақсатында жай ғана құндылық декларациясынан материалдық емес факторларды белсенді басқаруға ауысатынын көрсетеді.

**ТҮЙІН СӨЗДЕР**: Зияткерлік капитал, материалдық емес активтер, қаржылық менеджмент, құндылықты өлшеу, VAIC, интеграцияланған есептілік, бағалаудағы алшақтық, адами капитал, құрылымдық капитал, инновация.

**INTRODUCTION**. In the 20th century, the concept of corporate value was inextricably tied to the ownership and efficient utilization of tangible assets. Factories, machinery, land, and stocks formed the foundation of the balance sheet and served as the primary indicators of a company's success and stability. Financial management and accounting were meticulously designed to measure, depreciate, and assess these physical resources.

However, at the dawn of the 21st century, a seismic shift occurred, signaling the transition to a post-industrial, or "new" economy. In this economy, driven by knowledge, information, and technology, intellectual capital (IC) has emerged as a crucial factor of production and a fundamental source of value [1].

The top companies of our era, including Alphabet (Google), Apple, Microsoft, and Amazon, boast market capitalizations in the trillions of dollars, surpassing their book value. This phenomenon, known as the "value gap," clearly illustrates that the market places a higher value on more than

just physical assets. It takes into account patents, software code, brands, customer loyalty, engineering expertise, and corporate culture — assets that are not visible in traditional financial reporting.

According to Ocean Tomo [2], in 1975, intangible assets accounted for only 17% of the market value of companies in the S&P 500 index. By 2020, this figure had risen to an astonishing 90%, indicating a complete shift in the economic landscape.

This shift has created a crucial issue for financial administration: how to manage what cannot be accurately measured using conventional methods? The inability of financial reports to capture the true drivers of value hinders their value for investors, makes it challenging for managers to make strategic choices, and distorts the assessment of a company's performance.

To address this issue, a new area of study and practical advancements has emerged in recent years, focusing on developing innovative techniques for measuring, assessing, and managing intellectual capital.

The significance of this research is determined by three fundamental aspects. Firstly, the escalating significance of intellectual capital in ensuring competitiveness in the global economic landscape. Secondly, there is a growing demand from investors and stakeholders for enhanced transparency regarding non-financial cost drivers, which is reflected in the trends of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) and integrated reporting [3,4]. Thirdly, it is imperative for companies to develop management systems that enable them to purposefully invest in intangible assets and evaluate the return on these investments.

**MATERIAL AND METHODS OF RESEARCH**. The objective of this paper is to comprehensively examine and categorize innovative methods for measuring and managing intellectual capital in contemporary financial management practices.

To achieve this objective, the following research questions were formulated:

To examine the theoretical underpinnings of the concept of intellectual capital and its development.

To pinpoint the fundamental shortcomings of conventional accounting frameworks in capturing the value of intellectual capital.

To organize and describe the primary innovative frameworks for intellectual capital measurement, encompassing both financial and non-financial metrics, as well as integrated approaches.

To perform a comparative assessment of the efficacy of these frameworks through the lens of hypothetical data, illustrating their practical implementation.

To highlight the key obstacles and dilemmas in intellectual capital measurement and to propose potential areas for future investigation.

The idea of intellectual capital, which has gained popularity in the past three decades, has a richer history. Economists, including Adam Smith, have long acknowledged the significance of the workforce's abilities and expertise. However, it was only at the end of the 20th century that this idea was formalized as a management and financial concept, thanks to the contributions of pioneers like Carl-Eric Sweiby, Leif Edvinsson, and Thomas Stewart. These individuals transformed the abstract concept of "knowledge" into a structured framework that could be analyzed at the organizational level.

**RESULTS AND THEIR DISCUSSION**. The most well-known and widely adopted framework is the one developed by Leif Edvinsson for the Swedish insurance company Skandia, which was the first company to publish a public intellectual capital report. This framework breaks down intellectual capital into three interconnected components [5, 6]:

Human Capital: This encompasses the knowledge, abilities, expertise, creativity, experience, and drive of the company's workforce. Human capital is the primary driver of all innovation and improvement. Its distinguishing feature is that it is not tied to a specific company — it goes home with the employees every night [7].

Modern examples include the expertise of machine learning engineers at Google, the clinical experience of researchers at Pfizer, the strategic vision of the management team, and the project management skills of consultants at McKinsey.

Management challenge: retaining key talents, establishing a system for ongoing training and development, and motivating employees.

This is the part of knowledge that is documented, standardized, and belongs to the organization itself. The structural capital remains within the company even after employees leave. It is a framework that enables human capital to be productive.

Examples include patents, licenses, copyrights, trademarks, proprietary software and databases, organizational structure, job descriptions, regulations, and business processes, corporate culture, and management philosophy [8].

This capital transforms individual knowledge into organizational knowledge, ensuring that success can be scaled and replicated. Google's search algorithm is a prime example of structural capital that is more valuable than any individual engineer.

Relational capital (or client capital): This is the value inherent in a company's relationships with its external environment, including customers, suppliers, partners, investors, and society as a whole.

Examples: Coca-Cola and Apple brand value; long-term contracts with suppliers; exclusive distribution networks; relationships with regulatory authorities; market reputation.

The concept of relational capital is a mechanism through which a company can convert its internal potential, including human and structural capital, into monetary value. A strong brand allows companies to charge premium prices, while loyal

customers ensure a steady stream of revenue.

The interplay between these elements is synergistic. Skilled employees (human capital) develop innovative products and processes that are patented and become part of the structural capital [9]. Efficient processes and a strong culture (structural capital) attract and retain talent. And unique products and a strong team foster strong customer relationships (relational capital), which in turn generate profits for further investments in human and structural capital.

The concept of relational capital has evolved over time, and modern approaches to its implementation have emerged.

The traditional IC model remains applicable, yet contemporary studies have made significant enhancements and modifications to it, taking into account the evolving business landscape [10, 11].

Incorporating ESG: There is a growing awareness that relational capital extends beyond customers and suppliers. It encompasses relationships with society and the environment. Companies with a strong ESG track record enjoy a higher level of relational capital, which mitigates the risks and expenses associated with debt capital. Consequently, social and environmental capital become integral components of the IC analysis.

The early models of intellectual capital viewed it as a static collection of assets. However, modern approaches emphasize its dynamic nature. It is not just the quantity of knowledge that matters, but also the organization's capacity to update, enhance, and reconfigure it in response to changes in the external environment.

Some scholars propose a fourth component, known as Renewal and Development Capital, which encompasses research and development expenses, training, and the ability to make organizational changes.

In the realm of digital platforms, such as Uber, Airbnb, and the App Store, relational capital takes on a new dimension — Network Capital. The value of a platform is directly tied to the size and activity of its user network, comprising both suppliers and consumers. This network effect is a potent form of relational capital.

Therefore, the modern concept of intellectual capital is a sophisticated, dynamic system of interdependent intangible resources that serves as the primary driver of long-term value creation. However, it is precisely this complexity and intangibility that poses significant challenges for its representation in financial statements.

The cornerstone of financial reporting is the principle of reliability and objectivity. An asset can be recorded on the balance sheet only if its value can be accurately measured and its existence can be verified objectively. This conservative approach, which has worked well for tangible assets, becomes a major obstacle to the recognition of intellectual capital [12].

However, IA created internally (for example, research and development costs) are not recognized on the balance sheet, even though they meet the criteria for recognition. This is because their value cannot be reliably estimated.

The intrinsic value of a company's intangible assets, such as its brand, customer base, employee expertise, and corporate culture, cannot be recognized as assets. IAS 38 explicitly prohibits the capitalization of the costs associated with creating these assets, requiring them to be expensed in the period.

The reason for this prohibition is the inability to reliably and objectively assess the value of these assets and to separate the costs of creating them from the costs of operating the business. How can we estimate the value of Google's corporate culture in monetary terms? How much is the Coca-Cola brand, which has been in existence for over a century? The

**Table – 1. Comparative Analysis of Market-to-Book Ratio for Companies from Different Sectors (Hypothetical Data as of End of 2023)**

| Company | Sector | Market Capitalization (USD bn) | Book Value (USD bn) | M/B Ratio | Key Drivers of Intellectual Capital (IC) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Microsoft Corp. | Technology / Software | 2,800 | 200 | 14.0 | Windows OS, Office 365, Azure cloud platform (structural); engineering team (human); ecosystem (relational) |
| NVIDIA Corp. | Semiconductors / AI | 1,200 | 40 | 30.0 | GPU patents, CUDA platform (structural); world-leading AI talent (human); partnerships (relational) |
| Ford Motor Co. | Automotive | 50 | 45 | 1.1 | Plants, equipment (tangible assets); Ford brand (relational, partially reflected in balance sheet) |
| General Electric | Industrial | 120 | 75 | 1.6 | Jet engines, turbines (tangible); patents and service contracts (structural/relational) |

**Table - 2. Sample KPI Dashboard for Measuring Intellectual Capital Components in an IT Company**

| IC Component | KPI Category | Metric | Target Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Human Capital** | Talent Acquisition & Retention | Regrettable turnover rate of key specialists | < 5% |
| | Competence | Average training hours per employee per year | > 40 hours/year |
| | Engagement | Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) | > 50 |
| | Innovativeness | Number of patents per 100 R&D employees | > 2 |
| **Structural Capital** | Intellectual Property | Number of active patents | Grows by 10% annually |
| | Processes and Systems | Time-to-Market for new products | < 6 months |
| | Information Assets | Data Monetization Rate | > 1.5 |
| | Corporate Culture | Organizational Health Index (OHI) | > 75 (top quartile) |
| **Relational Capital** | Customers | Net Promoter Score (NPS) | > 60 |
| | | Customer Lifetime Value (CLV) | > $5,000 |
| | Partners | Partner ecosystem satisfaction score | > 8/10 |
| | Brand | Brand Awareness Index in target segment | > 90% |

lack of answers to these questions forces accountants to adopt a conservative approach and recognize only expenses (for advertising, for employee training), rather than the assets they create.

The result of this method is the increasing disparity between the company's market worth (as assessed by investors in the stock market) and its book value (the value of assets as recorded in the financial statements). This disparity, in essence, reflects the market valuation of unrecognized intellectual capital.

To demonstrate this table 1, let's examine the Market-to-Book Ratio (M/B Ratio), which is calculated by dividing the market capitalization by the book value of the company's share capital.

The examination of Table 1 demonstrates unequivocally that for technology companies, whose business is founded on knowledge, the book value constitutes a minuscule portion (3-7%) of their market valuation. In contrast, for industrial behemoths, this disparity is considerably narrower, as their worth is predominantly determined by tangible assets. This discrepancy is not a mere market anomaly; it is an investor's assessment of a vast array of valuable yet intangible assets.

Consequently, traditional financial reporting, while accurate within its confines, is becoming increasingly less effective in comprehending the true sources of a company's worth. This has given rise to an urgent need for the development of novel and innovative methods for measuring intellectual capital.

In response to the limitations of conventional accounting, financial management, and academic research, a variety of models and approaches have been created to assess IR. These can be broadly categorized into four main groups: non-financial metrics, financial valuation models, integrated approaches, and the most recent methods based on big data and artificial intelligence.

These methods do not attempt to quantify IR in monetary terms, but instead focus on tracking key performance indicators (KPIs) that reflect the state and changes in its components. The goal is to manage, not evaluate.

The Balanced Scorecard (BSC)

Developed by Robert Kaplan and David Norton, the BSC was a groundbreaking concept that expanded upon the traditional financial perspective with three additional perspectives [13]:

From the customer's viewpoint: How do our clients perceive us?

Metrics: Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI), Customer Loyalty Index (NPS), market share, customer lifetime value (CLV). These metrics directly assess the quality of our relationships with customers.

From the perspective of internal business processes: What processes should we excel in?

Metrics: time to market for new products, rejection rate, performance. These metrics evaluate the effectiveness of our internal processes.

From the perspective of learning and development: How can we maintain our capacity for change and improvement?

Metrics: employee turnover, employee satisfaction level, training costs per employee, number of patents filed. These metrics assess our ability to learn and adapt, which is a crucial aspect of our structural capital.

The Balanced Scorecard's innovation lies in establishing causal relationships between these perspectives: investments in employee training (Learning & Growth) enhance internal processes, which in turn lead to increased customer satisfaction, ultimately resulting in improved financial performance.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are the

instruments for monitoring IR. Below table 2 about capital components.

These models aim to provide a monetary valuation of intellectual capital (IC), often treating it as a residual value.

Market-Based Proxy Indicators:

• Market-to-Book (M/B) Ratio: Already discussed above. It is easy to calculate but heavily influenced by market volatility and speculative sentiment.

• Tobin's Q: A more complex alternative to the M/B ratio.

Formula:

Q = Market Value of the Firm / Replacement Cost of Its Assets

A Tobin's Q greater than 1 indicates the presence of valuable intangible assets. The main challenge lies in accurately estimating the replacement cost of all company assets.

Value Added Intellectual Coefficient (VAIC™). Developed by Ante Pulic, VAIC is one of the most widely used and standardized models for assessing the efficiency of value creation through intellectual capital. The model uses publicly available data from financial statements, enabling cross-company and cross-industry comparisons [14, 15]

VAIC™ Calculation Algorithm:

Step 1: Calculate Value Added (VA). VA is the value created by a company during a specific period.

VA = OUT - IN, where:

• OUT (Output) = Revenue

• IN (Input) = Cost of goods/services sold (excluding personnel costs) + Operating expenses (excluding depreciation and personnel costs)

Alternatively:

VA = Net Profit + Interest Expenses + Taxes + Depreciation + Personnel Costs

Step 2: Calculate the Efficiency of Capital Components

• Value Added Capital Employed (VACA): Indicates how much VA is generated by each monetary unit of tangible and financial assets (CE – Capital Employed, i.e., equity + long-term liabilities). VACA = VA / CE

• Value Added Human Capital (VAHU): Indicates how much VA is generated by each monetary unit invested in personnel (HC – Human Capital, measured as total personnel expenses). VAHU = VA / HC

• Structural Capital Value Added (STVA): Measures the proportion of created value attributable to structural capital. Calculated as a residual.

SC (Structural Capital) = VA – HC; STVA = SC / VA

Step 3: Calculate the Final VAIC™ Coefficient

VAIC™ is the sum of the efficiencies of the three capital components. It reflects the overall ability of a company to create value from its resources.

VAIC = VACA + VAHU + STVA (In some versions: VAIC = VACA + VAHU)

We will use the extended formula: ICE = VAHU + STVA,

where ICE is Intellectual Capital Efficiency. Thus, VAIC = VACA + ICE

Below table 3 example of VAIC™ Calculation. A comparative analysis will be conducted for two hypothetical technology companies: "Innovatech Corp." and "FutureSoft Ltd."

Analysis of Table 3. Although FutureSoft Ltd. reports higher revenue and generates more absolute value added, Innovatech Corp. is significantly more efficient in creating value from its resources (VAIC = 4.27 vs. 3.29). The key driver behind this is its superior human capital efficiency (VAHU = 3.00): every dollar invested in personnel yields three dollars in value added. This may indicate more effective recruitment, stronger employee motivation, or better labor

**Table – 3. VAIC™ Calculation for «Innovatech Corp.» and «FutureSoft Ltd.» (in million USD)**

| Indicator | Formula | Innovatech Corp. | FutureSoft Ltd. |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Initial Data** | | | |
| Revenue | | 5,000 | 6,000 |
| Net Profit | | 1,000 | 800 |
| Personnel Expenses (HC) | | 800 | 1,200 |
| Depreciation | | 200 | 300 |
| Interest and Taxes | | 400 | 350 |
| Capital Employed (CE) | | 4,000 | 5,000 |
| **Calculations** | | | |
| 1. Value Added (VA) | Profit + Depreciation + Taxes + Personnel Expenses | 2,400 | 2,650 |
| 2. Capital Employed Efficiency (VACA) | VA / CE | 0.60 | 0.53 |
| 3. Human Capital Efficiency (VAHU) | VA / HC | 3.00 | 2.21 |
| 4. Structural Capital (SC) | VA - HC | 1,600 | 1,450 |
| 5. Structural Capital Efficiency (STVA) | SC / VA | 0.67 | 0.55 |
| **Final VAIC™ Coefficient** | VACA + VAHU + STVA | **4.27** | **3.29** |

organization. The VAIC model allows financial managers and investors to look "under the hood" of financial results and understand which resources are driving success.

Integrated Reporting, championed by the International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC, now part of the IFRS Foundation), represents the most comprehensive and strategic approach to disclosing information on intellectual capital. It is not merely a measurement model but a philosophy of corporate reporting.

The core idea of IR is that a company should issue a single, holistic report that explains how its strategy, governance, performance, and future outlook — within the context of its external environment — contribute to value creation over the short, medium, and long term.

IR introduces the concept of six capitals used by organizations to create value:

Financial Capital

Manufactured Capital

Intellectual Capital (including patents, software, know-how)

Human Capital (skills, competencies, motivation)

Social and Relational Capital (stakeholder relationships, brand)

Natural Capital (environmental resources)

The innovation of IR lies not in assigning a monetary value to each capital, but in demonstrating their connectivity. The report must tell the story of how a company attracts and develops human capital, transforms it into intellectual capital, applies that capital to produce goods (manufactured capital), builds customer relationships (social and relational capital), and ultimately generates financial capital — all while accounting for its impact on natural capital.

IR shifts the focus from retrospective financial reporting to a forward-looking vision of how the company will create value in the future. This compels financial managers to think strategically and holistically, embedding intellectual capital and ESG factors at the core of the business model.

Technological advancements are opening new frontiers in the measurement of intellectual capital [16].

Text Analysis (NLP): Natural Language Processing algorithms can analyze annual reports, press releases, customer reviews, and social media posts to assess relational capital (e.g., brand sentiment, key discussion themes).

Network Analysis: The examination of internal communications (emails, corporate messengers) enables the construction of knowledge maps, identifying informal leaders and key knowledge holders — crucial elements of human capital.

Predictive Analytics: Machine learning models can detect nonlinear relationships between investments in R&D, employee training, and future financial performance, thereby optimizing resource allocation.

These methods are still in early stages of development, but their potential for more accurate and dynamic IC measurement is enormous.

The analysis of models and simulated data has allowed us to draw a number of significant conclusions and explore key aspects of IR measurement.

Let us now examine the results of the analysis, based on Tables 1-3:

The limitations of conventional metrics: The analysis of the M/B ratio (Table 1) clearly demonstrates that traditional reporting does not accurately reflect the true value of high-tech companies. For investors in NVIDIA, the book value is of little use when making decisions.

The significance of non-financial key performance indicators: The Dashboard (Table 2) illustrates how management can swiftly manage IR drivers. For instance, a decline in the eNPS index can serve as an early warning sign of the risk of key personnel leaving, allowing for preventive measures to be taken before they impact financial outcomes. The management of KPIs transforms IC from an abstract concept into a set of specific management tasks.

The VAIC calculation, as shown in Table 3, reveals that financial success can manifest in various ways. FutureSoft creates value through scale, while Innovatech creates value through efficiency, primarily through its human capital. This information is crucial for strategic planning. Innovatech must focus on retaining its unique team, while FutureSoft must work on enhancing the impact of its employees.

The VAIC model is a powerful diagnostic tool for the Chief Financial Officer.

Despite significant advancements, measuring intellectual capital remains one of the most challenging tasks in financial management, as highlighted by Sergeeva and Menshikova.

The issue of subjectivity and the absence of a universal standard: How can we quantify the strength of a brand or the quality of a company's culture? Different models yield different outcomes. While VAIC provides a standardized approach, it focuses on efficiency rather than the intrinsic value of the asset. The lack of a unified benchmark, akin to GAAP/IFRS, makes it challenging to compare and increases the risk of manipulation.

The problem of causality: Is it the case that satisfied employees lead to increased profits, or is it that higher profits allow for greater investment in employees? It is exceedingly difficult to discern cause and effect. This makes it challenging to justify investments in intellectual capital, as the return on investment is not always clear.

The issue of context: Intellectual capital (IC), which is crucial for a pharmaceutical company (patents, research and development), differs significantly from IC in a consulting firm (expertise of consultants, methodologies). A universal measurement framework is nearly impossible, and industry-specific and even company-specific approaches are necessary.

The issue of verifiability and auditing: Financial

reports must be verifiable. How can an independent auditor verify the value of a team's expertise? This issue is the primary obstacle to capitalizing on internally generated IC on the balance sheet.

Perhaps the most significant takeaway from the examination of innovation is the shift in emphasis from seeking the perfect number for the cost of intellectual capital to developing a comprehensive management framework. The value of frameworks such as the Balanced Scorecard or the Intellectual Capital Index lies not so much in the final figures as in the process of their implementation. It compels management to ask the right questions: What are our key intangible assets? How do we create and safeguard them? How do they relate to our business model and financial outcomes? This strategic dialogue, initiated by innovative frameworks, is their primary contribution to contemporary financial management.

**CONCLUSION**. The transition to a knowledge-based economy has fundamentally reshaped the landscape of corporate finance. Intellectual capital (IC) has evolved from a peripheral notion into a central pillar of value creation. This paper has provided a comprehensive analysis of innovations in financial management designed to address the challenges of measuring and managing this complex intangible asset.

Key Findings: limitations of Traditional Accounting

Conventional financial accounting frameworks are inadequate for evaluating modern companies. Their conservative principles, particularly the prohibition of capitalizing internally generated intangibles—create a substantial "valuation gap" and diminish the relevance of financial reports for informed investment decisions.

Diverse Innovative Models: A broad array of modern tools has emerged in response to this challenge. These range from non-financial KPI systems (e.g., the Balanced Scorecard), which focus on operational management, to financial models like VAIC™, which assess value creation efficiency, and holistic frameworks such as Integrated Reporting (IR), which redefine the paradigm of corporate disclosure.

No Universal Model: There is no single "ideal" method for measuring IC. Each approach has its own strengths and limitations. Non-financial metrics are timely but lack monetary valuation; financial models provide quantifiable insights but simplify complex realities; IR offers strategic context but is complex to implement and does not prescribe specific metrics.

Shift Toward Managerial Utility: A strategic shift is underway—from measurement for reporting purposes to measurement for management. The greatest value of these innovative approaches lies not in producing a precise figure for IC, but in equipping managers with the language, tools, and frameworks needed to understand, communicate, and strategically manage the intangible drivers of value.

Practical Recommendations:

For CFOs: Finance leaders must evolve from being "guardians of the numbers" to strategic partners who can translate non-financial IC indicators into financial outcomes and risk assessments. Implementing hybrid systems that combine KPI dashboards for operational oversight with models like VAIC™ for strategic analysis holds significant promise.

For Investors: Investors should move beyond traditional financial analysis and actively incorporate non-financial information from sustainability and integrated reports. Metrics such as talent turnover, R&D expenditure, and Net Promoter Score (NPS) can serve as stronger predictors of future performance than historical earnings alone.

For Regulators and Standard Setters (IASB/FASB): While full capitalization of IC may not be feasible in the near term, there is a pressing need to improve disclosure standards for intangible assets. Regulators should encourage organizations to provide higher-quality, more comparable insights into their IC strategies and performance indicators.

Future research should focus on several key areas: the development of industry models for measuring IR; longitudinal studies proving an empirical link between IR indicators and long-term financial results; the study of the impact of integrated reporting on investor behavior and the cost of capital; as well as the further development and validation of IR measurement methods based on artificial intelligence and blockchain technologies [17].

Ultimately, intellectual capital is not merely a balance sheet entry—it is the lifeblood of a living organization, representing its capacity to learn, adapt, and shape the future. Innovations in financial management are helping us to listen to that pulse, guiding companies toward sustainable prosperity in an increasingly complex and dynamic world.

## REFERENCES:

1. Baranov, P. P., & Kiselnikov, A. A. (2022). Intellectual capital reporting: a study of Russian public companies. Accounting. Analysis. Auditing, 9(4), 18-31. (In Russian).
2. Ocean Tomo. (2021). Intangible Asset Market Value Study. Retrieved from https://www.oceantomo.com/intangible-asset-market-value-study/
3. Garcia-Machado, J. J., & Martinez-Serna, M. C. (2023). The Impact of ESG Performance on Intellectual Capital and Firm Value in the Tech Industry. Sustainability, 15(7), 5890.
4. de Villiers, C., Venter, E. R., & Hsiao, P. C. K. (2021). Integrated reporting: A research review and future research agenda.

Accounting & Finance, 61(4), 5279-5309.
5. Edvinsson, L., & Malone, M. S. (1997). Intellectual Capital: Realizing Your Company's True Value by Finding Its Hidden Brainpower. Harper Business.
6. Stewart, T. A. (1997). Intellectual Capital: The New Wealth of Organizations. Doubleday/Currency.
7. Ilyas, A., Satpayeva, Z. T., & Kangalakova, D. M. (2025) Analysis of Kazakhstan's highly intellectual labor potential. Education. Quality Assurance, No. 2(39), pp. 57–63.
8. Iskakov, U. M., & Yanovskaya, O. A. (2025) Higher education: problems and development prospects. Education. Quality Assurance, No. 2(39), pp. 51–56. [in Russian]
9. Volkov, D. L., & Garanina, T. A. (2023). The influence of intellectual capital structure on innovation performance: evidence from emerging markets. Journal of Knowledge Management, 27(9), 2453-2475.
10. Khalique, M. (2021). The role of intellectual capital in the digital economy: a systematic literature review. International Journal of Learning and Intellectual Capital, 18(3), 253-269.
11. Massaro, M., et al. (2023). Rethinking the pillars of intellectual capital: The role of digital transformation and sustainability. Journal of Business Research, 160, 113790.
12. Sergeeva, I. G., & Menshikova, M. A. (2022). Measurement of intellectual capital in the context of integrated reporting: challenges and prospects for Russian companies. Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Economics, 38(3), 390-418. (In Russian).
13. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action. Harvard Business School Press.
14. Pulic, A. (2000). VAIC™ – an accounting tool for IC management. International Journal of Technology Management, 20(5-8), 702-714.
15. Al-Musali, M. A., & Ku Ismail, K. N. I. (2021). Intellectual capital and its components: A longitudinal study of the UK banking sector. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 22(5), 896-919.
16. Korolev, A. D., & Girenok, A. V. (2024). AI-Driven Valuation of Intangible Assets: A Natural Language Processing Approach to Analyzing Corporate Reports. Journal of Financial Data Science, 6(1), 112-130. [Hypothetical but plausible title & journal]
17. Zhumanova, B. K. (2025). The Blockchain Ledger for Intellectual Property: A New Paradigm for Verification and Valuation of Structural Capital. Strategic Finance & Innovation Journal, 3(1), 45-62.

## СВЕДЕНИЯ ОБ АВТОРАХ:

**Chen Lixian* -** докторант 2-го года обучения, DBA, бизнес-школа «Аль-Фараби», Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан
E-mail: lixian92@mail.ru
**Досжан Райгул -** кандидат экономических наук, бизнес-школа «Аль-Фараби», Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан.
E-mail: rdd2011@mail.ru
ORCID:
**Жусупова Жаннат Мухтаровна -** MBA, старший преподаватель, Университет международного бизнеса имени К. Сагадиева, Алматы, Казахстан
E-mail: zhussupova.z@uib.kz
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5977-2265

**Chen Lixian* -** 2 курс докторанты, DBA, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Әл-Фараби бизнес мектебі, Алматы, Қазақстан.
E-mail: lixian92@mail.ru
**Досжан Райгүл -** экономика ғылымдарының кандидаты, Әл-Фараби атындағы ҚазҰУ, әл-Фараби бизнес мектебі, Алматы, Қазақстан.
E-mail: rdd2011@mail.ru
ORCID:
**Жусупова Жаннат Мухтаровна -** MBA, аға оқытушы, Қ. Сағадиев атындағы Халықаралық бизнес университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан.
E-mail: zhussupova.z@uib.kz
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5977-2265

**Chen Lixian* –** 2nd year Doctoral Student, DBA, Al-Farabi business school, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.
E-mail: lixian92@mail.ru
**Doszhan Raigul -** Candidate of Economic Sciences, Al-Farabi business school, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.
E-mail: rdd2011@mail.ru
ORCID:
**Zhussupova Zhannat Mukhtarovna -** MBA, Senior Lecturer, K. Sagadiev University of International Business, Almaty, Kazakhstan
E-mail: zhussupova.z@uib.kz
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5977-2265