

A Critical Overview of Intellectual Capital: Theoretical Foundations, Models, and Strategic Relevance

Rana Abdul Hafez Taha, Afzal Izzaz Zahari, Chee-Wooi Hooy

School of Management, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Penang, Malaysia

Corresponding Author Email: afzalizzaz@usm.my

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJAREMS/v14-i3/26138>

Published Online: 03 September 2025

Abstract

This paper provides a comprehensive and critical review of intellectual capital (IC) as a theoretical and organizational construct. Situated within the broader transition to knowledge-based economies, IC is explored through its conceptual foundations, definitional diversity, and classification into human, structural, and relational dimensions. The study integrates major theoretical perspectives, including the Resource-Based and Knowledge-Based Views, Stakeholder and Institutional Theories, and systems-oriented frameworks that have shaped the field. It also examines key IC measurement models such as VAIC, MVAIC, and narrative-based approaches like Integrated Reporting and the Balanced Scorecard. Special attention is given to the strategic role of IC in various sectors, including emerging economies, as well as evolving practices of IC disclosure and reporting. The paper reflects on methodological trends in IC research, noting the diversification of quantitative, qualitative, and context-sensitive approaches. Overall, the study argues for the recognition of IC as a distinct and interdisciplinary domain of inquiry, essential for understanding value creation, innovation, and sustainable performance in contemporary organizations.

Keywords: Intellectual Capital, Human Capital, Structural Capital, Relational Capital, Capital Employed, Value Added Intellectual Capital (VAIC), Resource-Based View (RBV), IC Disclosure

Introduction

In the contemporary landscape of the knowledge economy, the creation and management of intangible assets have emerged as central determinants of organizational success and national competitiveness. Unlike the industrial era, where physical capital, land, and labour were the primary drivers of value, the knowledge economy is characterized by its reliance on intellectual resources that are intangible, often invisible and rooted in people, processes, relationships, and innovation (Rong et al., 2025).

Within this context, Intellectual Capital (IC) has attracted increasing attention from scholars, policymakers, and practitioners alike. It broadly refers to the stock of knowledge, competencies, organizational routines, and external relationships that enable organizations

to generate value, adapt to change, and achieve sustainable growth (Nguyen, 2023). IC is commonly understood as comprising three main dimensions: human, structural, and relational capital, each reflecting a distinct source of embedded organizational knowledge (Barak & Sharma, 2024).

The growing importance of IC is tightly linked to structural shifts in the global economy. As knowledge-intensive industries such as finance, education, healthcare, and technology continue to expand, traditional inputs like machinery and raw materials have become relatively less influential (Jordão et al., 2025). In their place, intangible assets such as brand reputation, customer loyalty, process efficiency, and intellectual property have become the key sources of value creation. This shift has significant implications for how organizations are managed, how performance is measured, and how competitive advantage is sustained over time (Ali et al., 2022).

Moreover, the rise of digital technologies, innovation-driven markets, and the increasing pace of change have placed even greater emphasis on organizations' intellectual capabilities. Firms that can effectively capture, leverage, and develop their intellectual capital are better situated to respond to disruption, innovate continuously, and engage in strategic renewal (Pirogova et al., 2020). Consequently, intellectual capital has become not only a subject of academic inquiry but also a strategic concern in corporate boardrooms and national policy agendas.

Although intellectual capital has become a widely recognized construct within organizational theory, its theoretical development continues to reflect a broad diversity of perspectives and approaches. Researchers have explored IC from multiple disciplinary perspectives, including strategic management, accounting, knowledge management, and innovation studies, each contributing unique insights into its nature and role. This diversity, while enriching the field, has also led to differences in terminology, scope, and emphasis across studies. Rather than indicating confusion, such variation reflects the dynamic and context-sensitive character of IC, which evolves in response to organizational, cultural, and sectoral realities.

This paper aims to offer a structured and critical review of intellectual capital as a theoretical construct. It seeks to consolidate foundational definitions, examine key conceptual frameworks, evaluate prominent measurement models, and reflect on the assumptions that shape IC scholarship. The scope of the review is limited to the organizational perspective, with particular focus on how IC is theorized, applied, and applied within institutional contexts.

Conceptual Foundations of Intellectual Capital

The concept of intellectual capital (IC) has evolved steadily over the past few decades, driven by a growing awareness of knowledge as a critical economic resource. Early foundations emerged from human capital theory, which emphasized education and skills as productivity enhancers (Strober 1990). However, it was not until the 1990s that IC began to be formally recognized as a distinct organizational asset, largely in response to the limitations of traditional accounting systems in reflecting intangible value.

Over time, IC has matured into a multi-dimensional framework, supported by contributions from strategic management, innovation studies, and knowledge management. As knowledge-intensive sectors expanded, so did the academic and practical focus on identifying, managing,

and measuring intellectual resources (Soewarno & Tjahjadi, 2020). Today, IC is widely seen as a key driver of sustainable value creation, although its historical evolution has also contributed to its conceptual diversity (Mailani et al., 2024).

Despite broad consensus on its importance, intellectual capital remains a concept marked by definitional variety. While most definitions agree that IC represents intangible assets that generate value, scholars differ in emphasis, some focusing on knowledge, others on relationships, innovation capacity, or organizational learning (Soewarno & Tjahjadi, 2020; Pirogova et al., 2020; Ali et al., 2022; Rong et al., 2025). This variation reflects IC's contextual nature and its adaptation across industries and institutional environments.

At the structural level, IC is commonly classified into three core components: Human Capital, the knowledge, competencies, and creative abilities of employees. Structural Capital is the systems, routines, databases, and organizational culture that support knowledge application. Relational Capital is the value embedded in relationships with customers, partners, regulators, and other external stakeholders (Urban & Joubert, 2017). Some models introduce a fourth component, Capital Employed, referring to the financial and tangible resources used alongside intellectual assets (Ali et al., 2022). Although its inclusion is debated, it reflects growing interest in linking IC to broader resource configurations and performance metrics.

Clarifying the boundaries of IC also requires distinguishing it from related terms. Intangibles, for instance, represent a broader category that includes IC but also encompasses elements like brand equity, goodwill, and legal rights, some of which are not necessarily knowledge-based. Knowledge assets, meanwhile, refer primarily to codified knowledge stored in documents, systems, or databases. IC, by contrast, includes both codified and tacit knowledge, embedded in people and relationships (Rong et al., 2025). Organizational capabilities focus on a firm's ability to utilize resources toward strategic objectives; while they often rely on IC (Mostafiz et al., 2019), the two concepts are not interchangeable.

Understanding these distinctions is essential to avoid conceptual overlap, ensure clarity in theoretical modelling, and enhance the relevance of IC research in both academic and applied settings.

Theoretical Approaches to Intellectual Capital

Scholarly efforts to conceptualize intellectual capital (IC) have drawn upon a variety of theoretical frameworks, each offering distinct insights into how intangible assets are created, utilized, and sustained within organizations. Rather than being anchored in a single approach, IC has been explored through multiple perspectives that reflect its complexity and multidimensional nature. This section presents a critical discussion of the main theories that have shaped IC literature, highlighting how each contributes to understanding its dynamics and limitations.

One of the most frequently employed perspectives is the Resource-Based View (RBV), which frames organizations as bundles of strategic resources. According to RBV, sustainable competitive advantage arises from possessing resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (Wernerfelt, 1984). Intellectual capital, particularly human knowledge and organizational know-how, fits well within this framework. It is seen as a source of differentiation and long-term value. However, the RBV tends to treat resources as relatively

static, focusing on what firms "have" rather than on how they develop or transform these resources. This makes it less equipped to capture the dynamic and evolving characteristics of IC in knowledge-driven contexts (Ali et al., 2022; Nguyen, 2023; Rong et al., 2025).

Building upon the RBV, the Knowledge-Based View (KBV) offers a more refined theoretical perspective by treating knowledge as the central asset around which organizational capabilities are built (Curado & Bontis, 2006). From this perspective, firms are understood as knowledge-integrating institutions, and IC is seen as both an input and a product of knowledge processes such as learning, sharing, and innovation. KBV aligns closely with the foundational idea of IC and emphasizes the fluidity and tacitness of intellectual resources. However, its focus on internal knowledge dynamics sometimes comes at the expense of relational or stakeholder-oriented dimensions, and its abstract nature often makes empirical application challenging (Ujwary-Gil, 2017; Wang, 2014; Hesniati et al., 2019).

To address the broader environment in which organizations operate, some scholars have turned to Stakeholder Theory. This approach situates the organization within a web of relationships and argues that value is co-created through interactions with various stakeholders, not just shareholders (Oliveira et al., 2013). Within IC studies, this perspective has been particularly influential in framing relational capital, the value embedded in trust, networks, and reputational assets. Stakeholder Theory draws attention to ethical considerations, legitimacy, and the strategic management of relationships. Still, its generality can pose limitations for researchers seeking more focused analytical tools or quantifiable constructs related to IC (Oliveira et al., 2013; Shah et al., 2021; Kuralová & Margarisová, 2016).

Another stream of literature has incorporated Complexity Theory, which conceptualizes organizations as adaptive systems characterized by non-linearity, feedback loops, and emergent outcomes (Dumay, 2009). This approach is well-suited to studying IC because it acknowledges that the value of intangible assets often arises from their interactions rather than from their individual characteristics. Human capital, structural frameworks, and external relationships continuously influence each other in unpredictable ways. Complexity Theory allows for richer, system-level analysis, yet its abstract nature can limit practical applicability, especially when designing measurement tools or management frameworks (Dumay, 2009; Dumay & Cuganesan, 2011; Roos, G., 2017).

In addition to these core theories, Institutional Theory has offered important contributions, particularly in understanding how external pressures and norms shape the development and use of IC (Nielsen et al., 2016). Rather than viewing IC purely as a strategic asset, this perspective highlights how organizations often adopt IC-related practices to conform to expectations of legitimacy, accountability, or innovation leadership. This helps explain why IC is reported or structured differently across countries, sectors, or institutional environments. However, by focusing on external conformity, Institutional Theory may understate the strategic and performance-oriented functions of IC (Inkinen et al., 2017; Nielsen et al., 2016; Yang, 2015).

Lastly, Systems Theory presents IC as part of an integrated organizational whole, emphasizing the interdependence of various elements people, processes, and technologies (Stähle et

al.,2003). This approach is particularly useful in framing IC as an outcome of organizational synergy rather than isolated components. It supports the idea that value is co-produced through the interaction of human, structural, and relational capital. Still, Systems Theory often lacks the specificity needed for analytical modelling or empirical validation (Stähle et al.,2003; Smedlund & Pöyhönen, 2012).

Intellectual capital has been examined through several well-established theoretical perspectives, each contributing valuable insights to the field. Among these, the Resource-Based View (RBV) stands out as the most widely used and comprehensive framework in IC research, offering a strategic foundation for understanding intangible assets as key drivers of sustainable competitive advantage. The Knowledge-Based View (KBV) builds upon this by emphasizing the centrality of knowledge processes in organizational performance. Stakeholder and Institutional Theories, in turn, highlight the importance of external relationships, legitimacy, and social context in shaping IC. Additionally, Complexity and Systems Theories offer useful perspectives on the dynamic and interconnected nature of intellectual capital components. Together, these perspectives have played a central role in shaping how IC is theorized and studied across diverse organizational and institutional environments.

Intellectual Capital Models and Frameworks

As intellectual capital (IC) evolved into a key construct in organizational research and practice, various models and frameworks were developed to support its measurement, management, and communication. These models differ in structure and emphasis, yet all aim to capture the intangible drivers of value creation in a systematic manner. Their growing use reflects a shared recognition of IC as a central element in assessing organizational performance and strategic potential.

Among the most prominent and widely adopted models is the Value Added Intellectual Capital (VAIC). This framework offers a standardized method to estimate the efficiency of value creation through human capital, structural capital, and capital employed, using available financial data (Pulic, 2000). Its strength lies in its simplicity, replicability, and cross-industry applicability, making it particularly useful for large-scale empirical studies and benchmarking across firms and countries (Nadeem et al.,2019).

Building upon this foundation, the Modified VAIC (MVAIC) was introduced to further align with the three-dimensional IC structure commonly used in theory. By including relational capital as an explicit component, MVAIC enhances the representational breadth of the model. This addition reflects the increasing relevance of stakeholder relationships, customer interactions, and external networks in driving organizational success, especially in knowledge-intensive sectors (Xu & Liu, 2020; Ali et al., 2022).

Another important contribution is the IC Index, a flexible, indicator-based model that aggregates multiple metrics into a composite score aligned with human, structural, and relational capital. This model allows organizations to tailor IC measurement to their own context and strategic objectives. The IC Index has been especially useful in internal performance evaluation, developmental planning, and knowledge management initiatives, as

it emphasizes not only the presence of IC assets, but also their effective utilization (Weziak, 2007; Pew Tan et al, 2008; Bontis, 2012) .

In parallel with numeric and efficiency-based models, many organizations have adopted narrative-based frameworks that focus on qualitative representation and strategic storytelling (Dumay & Cuganesan, 2011; Dumay & Roslender, 2013). Two notable examples are the Integrated Reporting (IR) Framework and the Balanced Scorecard (BSC). Integrated Reporting incorporates IC as one of several key capitals within a comprehensive disclosure model, promoting transparency, stakeholder engagement, and long-term value creation. It is particularly influential in sectors where intangible performance cannot be easily captured through financial metrics alone (Abhayawansa et al., 2019). The Balanced Scorecard, although originally developed for performance management, integrates IC-related elements, particularly under its learning and growth, internal processes, and customer perspectives. It supports strategic alignment and helps organizations embed intellectual capital considerations into daily operations and decision-making (Daraio et al., 2023).

Historically, models such as the Skandia Navigator and the Intangible Asset Monitor have also played foundational roles in the development of IC thinking. The Skandia Navigator was among the first to offer a structured framework for IC disclosure, organizing indicators across financial, customer, process, renewal, and human capital domains (Edvinsson, 1997). The Intangible Asset Monitor, in turn, emphasized growth, efficiency, and renewal dimensions, linking IC directly to value generation and long-term sustainability (Erik Sveiby, 1997).

Together, these models have contributed significantly to the visibility, operationalization, and strategic integration of intellectual capital across diverse organizational contexts. Their presence in academic literature and corporate practice underscores the central role of IC in shaping modern value creation. While no single model captures every aspect of IC, each provides a distinct pathway for understanding and managing the intangible dimensions that increasingly define organizational success.

Strategic Role of Intellectual Capital in Organizations

Intellectual capital functions as a central enabler of organizational strategy, particularly in environments where value creation depends on knowledge, innovation, and adaptability. When effectively utilized, IC supports the development of capabilities that are difficult to imitate, reinforcing the organization's situat within competitive landscapes. Rather than serving as a passive asset, it actively shapes how firms evolve, interact with their environments, and renew their strategic direction over time (Xu et al., 2023).

Human capital contributes to this role by sustaining innovation and continuous improvement, while structural capital provides the systems and routines that embed expertise within the organization. Relational capital further enhances strategic situating through external alliances, customer trust, and stakeholder engagement elements that expand the organization's access to resources and markets (Ali et al., 2022). These dimensions of IC often operate in synergy, allowing firms to integrate knowledge flows across internal and external boundaries.

The influence of IC varies considerably across sectors. In service-oriented industries, such as consulting, healthcare, or IT, IC is often the primary source of value, with client-related knowledge, expertise, and reputation playing a decisive role. In education, human and relational capital dominate, as institutions rely heavily on faculty expertise and stakeholder relationships to maintain quality and legitimacy (Secundo et al., 2018). In financial services, IC is embedded in complex systems, client networks, and analytical competencies, which drive efficiency, risk management, and customer experience (Xu et al., 2023). The strategic importance of IC in each of these sectors is shaped by the degree to which intangible assets contribute to performance and differentiation.

In emerging markets, including countries in the Middle East such as Jordan, IC takes on additional strategic relevance. Limited access to physical capital or advanced technologies often increases reliance on intangible resources (Al-Khatib, 2022). Moreover, national efforts to transition toward knowledge-based economies have placed greater emphasis on education, innovation systems, and institutional learning. However, formal recognition and structured management of IC remain underdeveloped in many cases, particularly outside leading sectors such as finance or ICT. Organizations in these contexts face both challenges and opportunities: while IC measurement and reporting practices may be less institutionalized, there is significant potential to leverage local human capital, cultural capital, and relationship-based networks as strategic assets.

Understanding the strategic role of IC thus requires attention not only to its internal context, but also to the institutional and sectoral environments in which it operates. Whether through driving innovation, enhancing responsiveness, or securing long-term advantage, intellectual capital remains a key foundation for sustainable organizational performance.

Intellectual Capital Reporting and Disclosure

The increasing strategic importance of intellectual capital (IC) has led to growing interest in how it is reported and communicated to stakeholders. Over the past two decades, reporting practices have evolved along two main trajectories: voluntary disclosures initiated by organizations seeking to demonstrate intangible value, and formal frameworks developed through institutional and regulatory efforts. Both reflect the recognition that traditional financial statements are often insufficient to capture the full spectrum of resources that drive organizational performance (Manes et al., 2018).

Voluntary disclosure remains the predominant mode of IC reporting, especially in private and knowledge-intensive sectors. Organizations frequently include information on human resources, innovation activities, customer relationships, and internal processes in their annual reports or corporate social responsibility documents. These disclosures tend to be narrative in form and vary significantly in depth and consistency. They are often influenced by internal strategic priorities, stakeholder expectations, and the perceived reputational benefits of transparency (Singh & Kansal, M, 2011; Manes et al., 2018).

At the same time, formal efforts to standardize IC reporting have attracted traction through frameworks such as Integrated Reporting (IR), which situates intellectual capital as one of six capitals contributing to long-term value creation. Other models, such as the Skandia

Navigator and Balanced Scorecard, have also informed structured approaches to IC disclosure, especially in organizations aiming to align performance measurement with strategic communication (Rossi et al., 2021). Despite their differences, these frameworks share a focus on making intangible value visible, accessible, and strategically meaningful to both internal and external audiences.

However, reporting practices are often shaped by regulatory environments and cultural contexts, which influence both the content and tone of disclosure. A recurring challenge in the literature is the disconnect between measurement and reporting. While many organizations develop internal systems to monitor intellectual capital, only a portion of this information is shared externally (Buallay et al., 2019). This gap reflects not only concerns about proprietary knowledge, but also the absence of universally accepted metrics that would allow for comparability and credibility across firms and sectors. As a result, IC reporting often lacks the standardization and rigour associated with financial disclosures, despite its growing strategic relevance.

The evolution of IC reporting thus reflects a broader tension between strategic transparency and operational pragmatism. As interest in non-financial reporting continues to expand, particularly concerning ESG, sustainability, and innovation, intellectual capital is likely to remain a critical yet evolving element of organizational disclosure practices.

Methodological Reflections in IC Research

Research on intellectual capital (IC) has evolved through a range of methodological approaches, reflecting both the complexity of the concept and the diverse disciplinary backgrounds from which it has emerged. Quantitative methods have long dominated the field, particularly in studies aiming to model IC's contribution to financial performance or to benchmark its components across firms and sectors (Rong et al., 2025; Ali et al., 2022). These studies often rely on indices, econometric modelling, and secondary data drawn from annual reports or databases, which have supported the expansion of large-scale empirical analysis. At the same time, there has been a growing interest in qualitative and mixed-methods approaches that offer richer insights into how IC is constructed, interpreted, and enacted within organizations. Case studies, interviews, and content analysis have been especially valuable in capturing the tacit and contextual dimensions of IC that are less visible through numeric data alone. These approaches also allow researchers to explore how IC is embedded in organizational narratives, cultures, and relational dynamics (Alinda & Wakibi, 2025; Özer et al., 2015).

Moreover, as IC research continues to expand geographically and sectorally, there is increasing recognition of the need to incorporate context-sensitive analytical tools. National culture, regulatory structures, organizational maturity, and sector-specific logics all influence how IC is understood and applied (Nguyen, 2023). Methodologies that are capable of capturing this variability, especially those that combine qualitative depth with analytical rigour, can significantly enhance the explanatory power and relevance of future studies (Alinda & Wakibi, 2025).

Overall, the methodological landscape of IC research is becoming more diverse and reflective of the construct's multifaceted nature. Continued integration of empirical rigour with

conceptual exploration will be key to advancing both theoretical insight and practical impact in the field.

Conclusion

This paper has offered a structured and critical exploration of intellectual capital (IC) as a theoretical construct and area of scholarly inquiry. Through examining its historical development, definitional diversity, conceptual classifications, and theoretical foundations, the analysis has highlighted the richness and complexity that characterize the field. The review of IC models and disclosure frameworks further illustrated how the concept has been applied in both academic and practical domains, while methodological reflections underscored the evolving nature of research approaches in response to contextual and disciplinary shifts.

Across the literature, IC emerges not only as a key driver of value in knowledge-intensive environments, but also as a perspective through which organizations are increasingly understood and managed. Its role in innovation, strategic renewal, and stakeholder engagement situates it at the center of contemporary organizational thinking. The distinctiveness of IC lies in its ability to integrate human, structural, and relational dimensions of value dimensions that are often underrepresented in conventional economic or managerial models.

Given its conceptual depth, interdisciplinary relevance, and growing practical implications, intellectual capital warrants continued attention as a standalone research domain. Rather than being subsumed under broader categories such as knowledge management or intangibles, IC offers a unique platform for theorizing how intangible resources are created, sustained, and leveraged within complex institutional environments. Future research that further contextualizes IC, while also advancing its methodological and theoretical foundations, can significantly contribute to both academic progress and organizational effectiveness.

This study makes a distinct theoretical contribution by synthesizing diverse perspectives on intellectual capital (IC) into an integrated framework that acknowledges its dynamic, multi-dimensional nature. By bridging the Resource-Based and Knowledge-Based Views with stakeholder-oriented and systems-level approaches, the paper advances the conceptual clarity of IC and positions it as an independent research domain rather than a subsidiary concept within knowledge management or intangible assets. Contextually, the review offers valuable insights for organizations in emerging economies, where IC can compensate for constraints in physical capital and technological infrastructure. The discussion highlights how locally embedded human and relational capital, combined with context-sensitive structural capital, can serve as a strategic lever for innovation, competitiveness, and sustainable growth.

References

- Abhayawansa, S., Guthrie, J., & Bernardi, C. (2019). Intellectual capital accounting in the age of integrated reporting: a commentary. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 20(1), 2-10.
- Al-Khatib, A. W. (2022). Intellectual capital and innovation performance: the moderating role of big data analytics: evidence from the banking sector in Jordan. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, 17(3), 391-423.
- Ali, S., Murtaza, G., Hedvicakova, M., Jiang, J., & Naeem, M. (2022). Intellectual capital and financial performance: A comparative study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 967820.
- Alinda, K., & Wakibi, A. (2025). Cultivating sustainability practices through intellectual capital: a qualitative inquiry of medium and large manufacturing firms within an emerging economy. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 26(2), 469-490.
- Barak, M., & Sharma, R. K. (2024). Does intellectual capital impact the financial performance of Indian public sector banks? An empirical analysis using GMM. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1-11.
- Bontis, N. (2012). National intellectual capital index: The benchmarking of Arab countries. In *Intellectual capital for communities* (pp. 113-138). Routledge.
- Buallay, A. M., Hamdan, A. M. M., Zureigat, Q., & Dhaen, E. S. A. (2019). Does voluntary disclosures contributed to the intellectual capital efficiency?. *International Journal of Learning and Intellectual Capital*, 16(2), 145-179.
- Curado, C., & Bontis, N. (2006). The knowledge-based view of the firm and its theoretical precursor. *International Journal of Learning and Intellectual Capital*, 3(4), 367-381.
- Daraio, C., Di Leo, S., Iazzolino, G., & Laise, D. (2023). DEA, balanced scorecard and intellectual capital including the gender dimension: A comprehensive list of indicators. *International transactions in operational research*, 30(6), 2972-3012.
- Dumay, J. C. (2009). Intellectual capital measurement: a critical approach. *Journal of intellectual capital*, 10(2), 190-210.
- Dumay, J., & Cuganesan, S. (2011). Making sense of intellectual capital complexity: measuring through narrative. *Journal of Human Resource Costing & Accounting*, 15(1), 24-49.
- Dumay, J., & Cuganesan, S. (2011). Making sense of intellectual capital complexity: measuring through narrative. *Journal of Human Resource Costing & Accounting*, 15(1), 24-49.
- Dumay, J., & Roslender, R. (2013). Utilising narrative to improve the relevance of intellectual capital. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, 9(3), 248-279.
- Edvinsson, L. (1997). Developing intellectual capital at Skandia. *Long range planning*, 30(3), 366-373.
- Erik Sveiby, K. A. R. L. (1997). The intangible assets monitor. *Journal of Human Resource Costing & Accounting*, 2(1), 73-97.
- Hesniati, H., Margaretha, F., & Kristaung, R. (2019). Intellectual capital, knowledge management, and firm performance in Indonesia. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 4(6).
- Inkinen, H., Kianto, A., Vanhala, M., & Ritala, P. (2017). Structure of intellectual capital—an international comparison. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 30(5), 1160-1183.
- Jordão, R. V. D., Avelar, E. A., & Lúcio, M. A. (2025). The role of intellectual capital in the sustainable value creation of Brazilian listed companies. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*.

- Kuralová, K., & Margarisová, K. (2016). Intellectual capital disclosure at Czech public universities in relation to the stakeholder information need. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis*, 64(6).
- Mailani, D., Hulu, M. Z. T., Simamora, M. R., & Kesuma, S. A. (2024). Resource-Based View Theory to achieve a sustainable competitive advantage of the firm: Systematic literature review. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Studies*, 4(1), 1.
- Manes Rossi, F., Nicolò, G., & Tartaglia Polcini, P. (2018). New trends in intellectual capital reporting: Exploring online intellectual capital disclosure in Italian universities. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 19(4), 814-835.
- Mostafiz, M. I., Sambasivan, M., & Goh, S. K. (2019). Impacts of dynamic managerial capability and international opportunity identification on firm performance. *Multinational Business Review*, 27(4), 339-363.
- Nadeem, M., Dumay, J., & Massaro, M. (2019). If you can measure it, you can manage it: a case of intellectual capital. *Australian Accounting Review*, 29(2), 395-407.
- Nguyen, N. T. (2023). The impact of intellectual capital on service firm financial performance in emerging countries: The case of Vietnam. *Sustainability*, 15(9), 7332.
- Nielsen, C., Roslender, R., & Schaper, S. (2016, March). Continuities in the use of the intellectual capital statement approach: Elements of an institutional theory analysis. In *Accounting Forum* (Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 16-28). No longer published by Elsevier.
- Oliveira, L., Rodrigues, L. L., & Craig, R. (2013). Stakeholder Theory and the Voluntary Disclosure of Intellectual Capital Information. *Caspian Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 2(3).
- Özer, G., Ergun, E., & Yilmaz, O. (2015). Effects of intellectual capital on qualitative and quantitative performance: Evidence from Turkey. *South African journal of economic and management sciences*, 18(2), 143-154.
- Pew Tan, H., Plowman, D., & Hancock, P. (2008). The evolving research on intellectual capital. *Journal of intellectual capital*, 9(4), 585-608.
- Pirogova, O., Plotnikov, V., Makarov, I., & Grafov, A. (2020). The impact of digitalization on the Intellectual capital formation and use (case of service enterprises). In *E3S Web of Conferences* (Vol. 217, p. 06009). EDP Sciences.
- Pulic, A. (2000). VAIC™—an accounting tool for IC management. *International journal of technology management*, 20(5-8), 702-714.
- Rong, C., Sial, M. S., Álvarez-Otero, S., & Jo, H. (2025). Assessing the Intellectual Capital of Value Creation Process of Commercial Banks in the European Union. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 1-30.
- Roos, G. (2017). Knowledge management, intellectual capital, structural holes, economic complexity and national prosperity. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 18(4), 745-770.
- Rossi, M., Festa, G., Chouaibi, S., Fait, M., & Papa, A. (2021). The effects of business ethics and corporate social responsibility on intellectual capital voluntary disclosure. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 22(7), 1-23.
- Secundo, G., Lombardi, R., & Dumay, J. (2018). Intellectual capital in education. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 19(1), 2-9.
- Shah, S. Q. A., Lai, F. W., Shad, M. K., Konečná, Z., Goni, F. A., Chofreh, A. G., & Klemeš, J. J. (2021). The inclusion of intellectual capital into the green board committee to enhance firm performance. *Sustainability*, 13(19), 10849.
- Singh, S., & Kansal, M. (2011). Voluntary disclosures of intellectual capital: an empirical analysis. *Journal of intellectual capital*, 12(2), 301-318.

- Smedlund, A., & Pöyhönen, A. (2012). Intellectual capital creation in regions: a knowledge system approach. In *Intellectual capital for communities* (pp. 227-252). Routledge.
- Soewarno, N., & Tjahjadi, B. (2020). Measures that matter: an empirical investigation of intellectual capital and financial performance of banking firms in Indonesia. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 21(6), 1085-1106.
- Ståhle, P., Pöyhönen, A., & Ståhle, S. (2003). Analyzing dynamic intellectual capital: System-based theory and application. *Acta Universitatis Lappeenrantaensis*.
- Strober, M. H. (1990). Human capital theory: Implications for HR managers. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 29(2), 214-239.
- Ujwary-Gil, A. (2017). The business model and intellectual capital in the value creation of firms: A literature review. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 12(3), 368-386.
- Urban, B., & Joubert, G. C. D. S. (2017). Drivers of intellectual capital and organisational performance: a focus on human capital, structural capital and relational capital. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 14(1), 1243-1272.
- Wang, Z., Wang, N., & Liang, H. (2014). Knowledge sharing, intellectual capital and firm performance. *Management decision*, 52(2), 230-258.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic management journal*, 5(2), 171-180.
- Weziak, D. (2007). *Measurement of national intellectual capital: application to EU countries* (Vol. 13, pp. 2007-13). IRISS Working Paper Series.
- Xu, J., & Liu, F. (2020). The impact of intellectual capital on firm performance: A modified and extended VAIC model. *Journal of Competitiveness*, (1).
- Xu, J., Haris, M., & Liu, F. (2023). Intellectual capital efficiency and firms' financial performance based on business life cycle. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 24(3), 653-682.
- Yang, C. W. (2015). Implementing hospital innovation in Taiwan: the perspectives of institutional theory and social capital. *The International journal of health planning and management*, 30(4), 403-425.