

Management, Measurement and Disclosure of Intellectual Capital Information in Financial Statements: An Empirical Study of a Developing Economy

Author Details: Dr. Madan Lal Bhasin

Professor, School of Accountancy, College of Business,
Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM), Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia

Abstract:

In the 21st century, economic growth will be driven by people leveraging their know-how, innovation and reputation, surpassing the contributory role of capital, land and equipment. In today's knowledge-based economies, Intellectual Capital (IC), in addition to financial and physical capital, plays a significant role in the value creation process of organizations. It is argued that the success of many 21st century organizations will lie in their ability to unlock and exploit their IC to obtain maximum organizational advantage. In an ever increasing competitive world, measurement, management and disclosure of IC are an important and useful means to keep investors well-informed. IC management is a wide process, which aims to utilize and develop the IC and maximize the outcome of IC of the firm. Currently, IC disclosure is not compulsory, and IC disclosure is done by select few companies, purely on voluntary basis. Unfortunately, IC measurement and disclosure in the developing economy are still at a very nascent stage, especially in India. This study attempts to provide an insight into the style of IC disclosure done by the Indian companies. It is said that "what is measured in companies is also what finally gets managed." Traditional accounting practices will need to assimilate innovations that seek to meaningfully represent the true value of the intangible assets of the company.

In the knowledge age, it is the availability of IC and its effective use that determines the failure or success of an enterprise. IC is almost impossible to measure accurately but its returns can be nearly infinite. This paper investigates voluntary ICD by select Indian companies. This is an exploratory study of ICD and measurement by the 8 Indian companies over 5-year period, using content analysis and market value added (MVA) as research methodologies. IC is valued at market value (MV) minus book value (BV). The annual reports of the selected companies were collected from their respective web sites. As part of present study, various statistical techniques have been used to analyze the data. The findings show that on an average, the sample companies reported a positive value of IC; significant correlation has been noticed between tangible assets (TA) and net operating profits (NOP). However, no significant difference was found between percentage of IC to MV, and per cent of TA to MV. The study finds wide-disparity, low-level, and purely voluntary nature of the ICD made by the selected companies. Unfortunately, the omission of IC information may adversely influence the quality of decisions made by shareholders, or lead to material misstatements. Such challenges may be addressed by devising somewhat innovative accounting standards—beyond the existing ones—as necessary tools for authorities seeking to manage the IC of an entity. We recommend to the international accounting bodies, to take the lead by establishing a harmonized ICD standard, and provide guidance to the big listed companies for proper measurement and disclosure of IC, both for internal and external users.

Keywords: Intellectual capital, disclosure, market and book value, developing economy.

INTRODUCTION

The 21st century is heavily dominated by 'knowledge' economy and the world is changing rapidly from an 'industrial' economy to a 'knowledge' economy. The rise of the knowledge economy underpins the importance of knowledge management, intellectual capital, and innovation in economic development (Rodrigues et al., 2015). In the modern innovation-driven world, learning and the command of Intellectual Capital (henceforth, IC) have become the 'key' success factors of 'international' competitiveness. "During the last two decades, IC resources, such as human capital and customer relations, have become the new driver for corporate development, and companies which focus on their employee knowledge, innovation, and skills are developing more than those depending on their fiscal assets (Razak et al., 2016). IC is like a newly discovered, still uncharted ocean, and few executives understand its dimensions or how to navigate it. The term "IC" collectively refers to all of the intangible resources that determine the value and competitiveness of a company. Recently, Oksana and Inga (2016) stated, "Over the last three decades, the role of IC in ensuring an organization's competitiveness has increased significantly. It constitutes the knowledge resources, in the form of employees, customers, processes, and technologies, which the company can mobilize in its value creation processes. Therefore, the future drivers of any modern economy will not

longer be capital, land or equipment, but the “people” and their “knowledge” reservoirs,” says Bhasin (2015).

Business dynamics of the present century are increasingly determined and driven by IC elements. For example, Survilaite et al., (2015), pointed out, “In the era of information and knowledge, effective use of IC is the most important factor that determines the success of a business. The ‘traditional’ point of view has changed and companies have shifted their focus from investments into ‘tangible’ assets (TA) to investments in ‘intangible’ assets (IA). In fact, IC is considered to be an intangible resource with human, structural, and customer capital as its key components.” According to Anuonye (2015), “IC is the total of all human efforts in the form of IA, which can be measured, and through which organizations can gain competitive advantage. The inability of firms to measure and quantify IC has posed fundamental problems overtime in the ‘value’ measurement of firms.” The concept of IC measurement, management and disclosure is still relatively new. Successful management of knowledge and intellectual capital is recognized as the key task for managers in knowledge-based economy. Indeed, IC measurement is considered to be one of the most important components of IC management practice. It is vital for company’s ‘strategic’ management, ‘continuous’ improvements and organizational ‘development’. In the other words, IC Management (ICM) is a wide process which aim is to utilize and develop the IC in a company. ICM’s purpose is to save and maximize the outcome of the intellectual capital of the firm. Asia Pacific Intellectual Capital Centre defines, “ICM consists of (a) Analyzing existing enterprise knowledge, updating it and recording it, as far as possible, and making it sharable within the enterprise in order to better fulfill the business plans. This becomes the enterprise’s ‘structural capital’; (b) Creating the climate in which knowledge workers can best perform; (c) Identifying possible sources of revenue that could be extracted from existing structural capital and developing marketing plans for them; (d) Optimizing the value creation, extraction and release cycles for new and existing initiatives, and (e) Assessing risks involved in protecting the enterprise’s intellectual assets (or structural capital) and using an effective intellectual property strategy to minimize business risk.”

Moreover, IC measurement methodology is one of the cornerstones in IC theory development. “Some of the prominent models/methods for measuring and estimating IC of a company are: Skandia Navigator, Organizational IC, IC-index, Technology Broker’s IC Audit, Intangible Asset Monitor, MVA and EVA, Citation Weighted Patents, Tobin Q’s Ratio, Human Resource Accounting, Balanced Scorecard etc.” added Bhasin (2014). Undoubtedly, IC measurement and management practices significantly differ among countries, industries or companies. However, it must be kept in mind that the process of managing and reporting on IC is highly idiosyncratic and unique to each and every firm. There is no universally valid recipe; each company should develop its own process of IC measurement and disclosure. Moreover, Bhasin (2011) stated, “After some initial research on business and intangible resources in the Indian corporations, we found that three corporations had published their first IC reports in 1997, which were discontinued later on. These firms are: Balrampur Chini Mills Limited, Reliance Industries Limited, and Shree Cement Limited. However, there were vast differences in the disclosure mechanisms and methodologies followed by these Indian corporations.” In the time of knowledge economy, the IC gradually replaces the real capital and changes to the headspring of value enhancement for modern enterprises. To acquire advantages in the market competition, modern enterprises should not only innovate upon products, marketing channels, market and services, but also enhance the research & development ability of market and product, and specially pay attention to the cultivation and management the enterprise IC. In many cases, knowledge-intensive firms, such as Microsoft, Xerox, Dow Chemical, Hewlett-Packard, Eastman Chemical and others have their marketplace value at a price far higher than their balance sheets warrant. Thus, a company’s value is more than the TA, the source of its value and wealth is no longer the production of material goods but the creation and manipulation of its IA (or IC).

“While IC is relevant to financial and accounting professionals its measurement and disclosure is an important and complex issue for management. For example, management may use a disclosure strategy to convince ‘external’ parties of the underlying value of the firm. On the other hand, management may decide to constrain its ‘transparency’ in order to protect certain important information,” says Bhasin (2016). As far as the IC disclosure (henceforth, ICD) is concerned, unfortunately rarely some select organizations from across the world are ‘consistently’ providing ICD in their financial statements (in brief, FS). However,

market participants, practitioners and regulators alike argue that there is an important need for greater investigation and understanding of ICD, as the usefulness of financial information contained in FS in explaining firm profitability continues to deteriorate. Bukh (2005), for example, asserts that “traditional disclosure ‘mechanisms’ are not able to cope adequately with the disclosure requirements of ‘new’ economy firms.” He observed “an increasing dissatisfaction with traditional financial disclosure and its ability to convey to investors the wealth-creation potential of firms.” Similarly, Berzkalne and Zelgalve (2014) pointed out that “it is necessary to develop a new framework to identify, classify and calculate the value of IC. In addition, the new methodology should be able to better explain the difference between company’s book value (BV) and market value (MV) than the existing methodologies.” The FS has long outlived itself as the best source of corporate disclosure because it contains backwards looking information and is only a one-way means of presenting information rather than engaging with information users. Considering the future prospects of financial reporting system for capital markets and other stakeholders, some organizations are now motivated to evolving a dialogue on finding new ways to measure and report about their IC.

As Bhasin (2016a) stated, “The FS limitation, both in measuring and disclosing ‘intangible’ assets information is the fundamental cause of significant difference between ‘book’ value (BV) equity and ‘market’ value (MV) equity.” However, systematic measurement and disclosure of intangible assets (IA or IC) precisely and accurately is very important, because they have a positive and significant effect on the firm’s market value (Gamayuni, 2015). Therefore, accounting standards should be concerned about this, without further delays. The inclusion of IC information in the corporate FS would result in a balance sheet that more realistically describes the value of the company, and displays all relevant assets from which the company expects to obtain benefits in the coming years. Moreover, IC is critical to sustaining competitive advantage and is a valuable source of wealth creation. Thus, in an ever increasing competitive world, ICD are an important and useful means to keep investors well-informed (Abeysekera, 2007). “Although this is an appealing idea, unfortunately, it is not per definition of value to the disclosing company. In short, traditional financial metrics provide insight into “a company’s short-term performance but may not be the best way to measure the long-term value creation,” asserts Bhasin (2014).

It should be noted that “the terms intangible assets, knowledge assets/capital, or intellectual assets/capital are interchangeable and very often used as synonyms. The term IA can often be found in the accounting literature, whereas the term knowledge assets is used by economists, and IC is used in management and legal literature, but all refer essentially to the same thing,” concludes Bhasin (2007). The terms intangibles and intellectual capital are used to refer to the same concept. Both are applied to non-physical sources of future economic benefits that may or may not appear in corporate financial reports. However, these two terms tend to be used slightly differently: Intangibles is an accounting term, whereas the Intellectual Capital was coined in the human resources literature and is mainly used in this field. Further, Bhasin (2016) argues that “a firm’s most valuable and important resources are its IC or IA. Tangible assets (TA) can be easily imitated or acquired in the open market. Therefore, by definition, they cannot be strategic assets or advantage creating resources. Conversely, IC is most often internally generated and embedded in the skills and experience of its employees, its processes, procedures and routines, and its information repositories. Because of these characteristics, they are unique, difficult to imitate and valuable. In other words, they are advantage-creating resources.”

Various estimates indicate that “intangible” assets (IA) currently constitute about 60-75% of corporate value, on an average. In 1995 it was found that a major part (68%) of investment goes into IA, such as research and development, IT software, education and competences and internet. However, in 2009, IA was 81% of investments, which jumped to the level of 87% in 2015, an all-time high for the years covered by the firm’s research, which extends back to 1975, as shown in **Figure 1** graph. Hopefully, the rising trend will continue in future. Data reflected in the chart below reveals that IA value of the S&P 500 grew to an average of 84% by Jan. 1st, 2015, an increase of four percentage points over ten years. Here, Stathis (2015) reported, “Within the last quarter century, the market value of the S&P 500 companies has deviated greatly from their book value. This ‘value gap’ indicates that physical and financial accountable assets reflected on a company’s balance sheet comprises less than 20% of the true value of the average firm,” explained

Malackowski, Ocean Tomo's Chairman." Further, Lev (2001) compared that relationship between market value (MV) and book value (BV) of shares. In 1970, it was 1:1 and in mid-1990 it had increased to an average of three times. This statistical information provided an insight into the growing importance of IC. As quoted by Zambon and Monciardini (2015), "Lev pointed out that intangibles *per se* are inert, like bricks." Inert means to be in a state of doing little or nothing. Therefore, the only interest in intangibles *per se*, is when you try to sell them (patents, brands, software etc.). What is interesting to managers, policy-makers and investors is how intangibles interplay with other resources to create value. In other words, focusing only (or mainly) on the issue of measuring intangibles (accounting, disclosing and surveying IC), one runs the risk of looking at the 'finger' rather than the 'moon'. Looking at the moon, in this case, means to focus on IC as strategic resources, i.e., resources that create economic value, are rare, and difficult for competitors to imitate."

Figure 1 Graph



"No doubt, intangible assets (IA or IC) are enablers and sources of value to business, as they transform resources into value-added performance. Therefore, the corporate world is now devoting a lot of time and effort to manage its "intellectual" assets in order to improve its shareholder's wealth," stated Bhasin (2011c). According to Heitman (2016), "For centuries, executives expertly managed the total productivity of tangible assets, such as plants and equipment. They monitored both efficiency and effectiveness because tangible assets, or "things," historically accounted for more than 80% of business value. But in the last 40 years, tangible assets have declined to 15% of business value, while intangible assets now generate 85% of value." The traditional point of view has changed and companies have shifted their focus from investments into tangible assets to investments in intangibles (Survilaite et al., 2015). Therefore, the corporate world is now devoting a lot of time and effort to manage its "intellectual" assets in order to improve its shareholder's wealth. Despite growing interest and demand for IC information, prior research till date suggests a persistent and significant variation, both in the 'quantity' and 'quality' of information reported by firms on this pivotal resource. As existing economic and business metrics track a declining proportion of the real-economy, the deficiency and inconsistency in the disclosure of IC-related information is creating growing information "asymmetry" between 'informed' and 'uninformed' investors. This provides a fertile ground for informed investors to extract higher abnormal returns (Chiucchi et al., 2008). Thus, IC is increasingly being recognized as having much greater significance in creating and maintaining 'competitive' advantage and shareholder 'value'. This clearly calls for a refreshed understanding of business principles, information disclosure, and decision-making processes related to IC.

WHAT IS INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL?

Undoubtedly, IC can prove to be a source of competitive advantage for businesses, which may stimulate growth and lead to wealth generation in the long-term. "Unfortunately, the concept of IC measurement, management and disclosure is still relatively new. Accountants, business managers, and policy-makers have still to grapple with its concepts and detailed application methodologies," pointed out Bhasin (2008). However, Dadashinasab et al., (2015) stated: "According to resource-based view, one of the important resource for driving organizations performance and creating value is IC." There is a wide range of definitions of IC in the literature, and as expected, definition of IC varies substantially. According to Stewart

(2002), “It has become standard to say that a company’s IC is the sum of its Human Capital (talent), Structural Capital (intellectual property, methodologies, software, documents, and other knowledge artifacts), and Customer Capital (client relationships).” However, most comprehensive definition of IC is offered by the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA, 2001), “the possession of knowledge and experience, professional knowledge and skill, good relationships, and technological capacities, which when applied will give organizations competitive advantage.”

Unfortunately, there are number of considerable classifications of IC. For instance, Sveiby (2004) first proposed a classification for IC into three broad areas of intangibles, viz., Human capital, Structural capital and Customer capital—a classification that was later modified and extended by replacing customer capital by relational capital. Some examples of IC are shown in **Diagram-1**. The diagram is only a broad guide to the components of IC, as the elements combine and interact with each other, and with traditional capital elements (physical things and monetary elements) in ways unique to individual companies to create value.

Diagram-1: Components of Intellectual Capital.

Human Capital	Structural Capital	Customer Capital
Knowledge	Business processes	Customer relations
Competence	Manuals/ policies	Customer Loyalty
Skills	Information systems	Repeat business...
Individual & Collective Experiences	Research findings	
Training	Trademarks	
Communities of practice...	Brands...	
		Relational Capital
		Relations with vendors
		Investor trust and feedback...

WHY TO MEASURE, MANAGE AND DISCLOSE IC?

A common view on IC measurement, management, as well as, generally accepted IC disclosure principles still do not exist. Several methodologies are under the development and refinement process, and many unanswered questions still exist. Besides, IC measurement, disclosure, and management practices adopted by different companies vary and depend on different factors. According to Uziene and Stankute (2015), “IC measurement methods are usually intended to accomplish one of the missions: (1) measurement for ‘internal’ management and decision-making; and (2) measurement for ‘external’ information disclosure as a supplement to FS. In the first case, managers act as receivers of information, while IC measurement methods perform the role of corporate ‘performance’ measurement. In the second case, information received is intended for ‘external’ stakeholders, while IC measurement methods perform the role of ‘public’ disclosure and corporate ‘image’ building.” Thus, effective management of intangibles might also increase the firm’s commitment with its IC. Bhasin (2015a) reported, “The IC Report is the report wherein the company ‘discloses’ on its IC. It is the ‘logical’ conclusion of the IC management process: communicating to stakeholders the firm’s abilities, resources and commitments in relation to the fundamental determinant of the firm’s value. Regardless of who is responsible for the preparation of the IC Report, top management should be committed to and engaged in the preparation of the IC Report? Finally, the IC Statement may be published together with, or at the same time, as the annual financial report is disclosed.”

After some initial research on business and intangible resources in the Indian corporations, “we found that three corporations had published their first IC reports in 1997, which were discontinued later on. These firms are: Balrampur Chini Mills Limited, Reliance Industries Limited, and Shree Cement Limited. However, there were vast differences in the disclosure mechanisms and methodologies followed by these Indian corporations,” said Bhasin (2011a). In this context, Kamath (2008) lucidly concludes, “Some firms have been considering IC as an inseparable part of their total assets and disclosed it in their annual reports as ICR using the ‘standard’ disclosure models. And, others published those reports as a ‘supplement’ to their annual reports, and some others give the details of growth in their IC over the previous period in a ‘separate section’ in their annual report.” There is no doubt that in India, IC disclosure is still in its ‘evolutionary’ stages and

all the three means of disclosure are equally accepted and practiced. Moreover, we appreciate the growing awareness and attempts made by some leading IT corporations to disclose IC in their annual reports. The Indian ICR does not focus on any specific business model, values, mission and vision, and/or knowledge management issues, as is the case with the European ICR. It presents information mostly in a 'narrative' style. It describes a firm's IC and analyses its components without focusing extensively on specific indicators that measure these components. This is a major distinctive feature of Indian ICR. In sharp contrast with the European Union ICR, Indian reports do not combine a "narrative" and "quantifying" style (Abeysekera, 2007). All Indian ICR analyzed in this study constitute an 'independent' document that 'complement' the Annual Reports. However, their length is much larger than the European reports. It is clear that corporations in the European are way ahead of their counterparts elsewhere when it comes to the measurement, disclosure and management of their IC (Andriessen, 2004). Finally, one of the firms in this study—Reliance Industries Limited—even created a specific term for investor relations (the investor capital) and provides an in-depth analysis of this capital.

The inability of firms to measure and quantify IC has posed fundamental problems overtime in the value measurement of firms. The pressure from investors and emerging global markets, which are very demanding on the quality of information and analysis of business performance, have led some groups "to voluntarily disclose information explaining their IC investments" (Depoers, 2000). As Charumathi and Ramesh (2015) stated, "In the current scenario of financial reporting regime, investors are increasingly looking at the disclosure practices of companies. The companies also face capital market pressures and need to disclose more than the regulatory norms. There could be several motivators for the companies to disclose more information voluntarily." As Bhasin (2011) stated, "Fortunately, the corporate world is now devoting a lot of time and effort to manage its 'intellectual' assets in order to improve its shareholder's wealth. "Hopefully, this information would complete the FS, provide evidence of the ability of firms to create value in the future, and give more credibility to the information summarized in the annual FS," (Dammak, 2015).

Companies may, therefore, want to measure IC for a variety of reasons. One study by Bernard (2003) identified the following five main reasons. First, measuring IC can help an organization to formulate business strategy. By identifying and developing its IC, an organization may gain a competitive advantage. Second, measuring IC may lead to the development of key performance indicators that will help evaluate the execution of strategy. IC, even if measured properly, has little value unless it can be linked to the firm's strategy. Third, IC may be measured to assist in evaluating mergers and acquisitions, particularly to determine the prices paid by the acquiring firms. Fourth, using non-financial measures of IC can be linked to an organization's incentive and compensation plan. However, the first four reasons are all internal to the organization. A fifth reason is 'external': to communicate to all stakeholders' what intellectual property the firm owns, how is it valued, and how much is its market worth, etc.? Undoubtedly, improving "external" disclosure of IC can (1) close the gap between book value and market value, (2) provide improved information about the real value of the organization, (3) reduce information asymmetry, (4) increase the ability to raise capital by providing a valuation on intangibles, and (5) enhance an organization's reputation. Disclosing IC information may produce both beneficial and dysfunctional effects. In fact, although a comprehensive theory of 'voluntary' disclosure does not exist so far, companies find different economic and managerial incentives in disclosing more than mandatory information, especially with reference to IC information. As Demartini and Trucco (2016), put forward, "these benefits should be balanced against some costs, such as the loss of competitive advantage for giving away company's secrets, the provision costs for collecting, organizing and disclosing information and the exposure to manipulation of disclosed information, which eventually could turn out into litigation costs." As Bhasin (2012a) concluded, "Good measures of IC, of course, will complement financial measures, provide a feedback mechanism for actions, provides information to develop new strategies, assist in weighting different courses of action, and enhance the management of the business as a whole."

WHAT IS THE ACCOUNTING 'CONNUNDRUM' ABOUT IC MEASUREMENT & DISCLOSURE?

Business has always relied on its “intangible” resources (IA), along with “tangible” resources (TA), to create value and achieve the organization’s goals. As very appropriately pointed out by Talukdar (2008) and Bhasin (2015), “The objective of a typical for-profit business firm is to use its assets for producing goods and/or render services, which it can sell for generating ‘cash’. It is the ‘readiness’ of the IA that determines the ‘efficiency’ of this cycle. The cash so generated is ‘used’ in general in one of three different ways. It is either capitalized into more TA, or spent for the development of more IA, or paid out as dividends. This is also the reason why TA appears on the balance sheet, whereas IA does not.” In order to understand how IC fits into the scheme of things, let us look at **Figure-1**. The real differentiator between one firm and the next therefore, is the “readiness of the firm’s IA for converting its TA into cash in the most efficient manner.” This readiness is known as “core competency” and it is the chief source of “competitive” advantage for companies. If the primary objective of all for-profit companies is to effectively manage their future cash flows, then they need to manage the ultimate drivers of these cash flows—the “intangible” assets. In order to be able to manage “intellectual” assets we have to recognize where this value is coming from and how it is created in an organization.




Figure 1: Asset to cash conversion cycle

Surprisingly, modern accounting systems are designed exclusively (with some exceptions) for measuring and reporting “tangible” assets. The Gartner Group, for example, estimates that “intellectual” assets are worth approximately three to four times an enterprise’s book value. The dilemma remains that, even though IC can outweigh physical assets enormously, it is very difficult to find measures that will accurately reflect their value within an instrument, such as the “balance sheet.” Moreover, physical and IC have different properties and should therefore, have different valuation methods. Recently, McCann (2016) stated, “It seems plain wacky that accounting rules still prohibit companies from including the value of internally created intangible assets in their FS, alongside tangible assets. After all, there is no debate that today a majority of most companies’ market value derives from brands, patents, technologies, and other IC. That was not the case when the process of standardizing accounting practices began hundreds of years ago. It was not even the case, for the most part, 30 years ago.”

Traditionally, physical assets (TA) are considered as leading determinants of the economic performance of any activity. Now, in ‘new’ economic system, IA is recognized as prominent resource. Thus, in the ‘modern’ economy, IC is the most important asset for the firm. For instance, Deep and Narwal (2014) described, “FS have failed to reflect the true value created by companies, because only TA is taken into account for measuring the performance of the firm. The legitimate justification is required for the increasing gap between the MV and BV of companies. The reason for this gap simply may perhaps be the absence of IA from the FS of the firm. When companies have a large proportion of their investment in IA and when traditional performance measurement techniques are used, then inappropriate decisions may be taken by investors and other stakeholders.” “Shockingly, modern accounting systems are designed exclusively, with some exceptions, for measuring and reporting TA. This creates the phenomena of the “invisible” balance sheet, described Bhasin (2015). **Figure-2** shows the balance sheet of a typical firm. Further, Talukdar (2008) pointed out, “Everything that appears below the ‘solid’ horizontal-line represents the ‘invisible’ assets of the firm. This is balanced on the right hand side by a corresponding ‘invisible’ equity. We already know that the MV of most public companies is considerably higher than their corresponding BV, which represents only

the TA of the firm.” The invisible equity of a firm can be considerably large depending on how effectively the firm is harnessing its IC.




Figure 2 : Market valuation of a firm equals visible plus invisible equity

In the business world where most of the organizational value is based on IA, the ability to recognize and estimate the sources of this value has become vital for companies. Recently, Dammak (2015) stated, “One way to measure knowledge assumes that the stock market implicitly performs the valuation.” In its simplest form, this method accepts the market to be invariably accurate in its valuations, and that any excess valuation of a company over its BV will be the correct valuation of the company’s IA or IC (Andriessen, 2004). Thus, the market capitalization is made up of the value of the physical assets (BV) and an additional intangible value (IC) associated, which is recognized by the financial market but ignored by the balance sheet. Generally, the relationship between IC and MV, in equation form, can be stated as:

$$\text{Market Value (MV)} = \text{Book Value (BV)} + \text{Intellectual Capital (IC)}$$

When there is a large disparity between a firm’s MV and BV, that difference is often attributed to “IC”. MV is, of course, the company’s total shares outstanding times the stock market price of each. However, Book Value (BV) is the excess of total assets over total liabilities. Thus, MV can be calculated as: Number of ordinary shares outstanding multiplied by the share price plus the number of outstanding preference shares multiplied by the share price minus the book value of invested capital (Anuonye, 2015). This equation shows that MV has a tangible portion BV, in addition to an intangible component IC. Hence, supposing MV minus BV is greater than zero ($MV - BV > 0$); it shows that the company needs to make provision for both measuring and disclosing its IC. “It can be assumed that the more knowledge-intensive the company is, the greater the IC value will be. The invisible equity of a firm can be considerably large depending on how effectively the firm is harnessing its IC. For companies in the service sector, it is disproportionately large in comparison to physical assets,” suggests Bhasin (2012). Thus, a long and arduous road still needs to be negotiated before we have reliable measurements and disclosures of IC information.

The Financial Accounting Standards Board’s (FASB), SFAS No. 142, “Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets,” provides the accounting basis for measuring IA. An IA that is acquired from an external source is initially recognized at its fair value. If an IA is developed internally, it is recognized as an expense when it is incurred. This will limit the recognition of most IC to what is purchased from outside the organization, such as patents, licenses, and trademarks, because they are the only ones recognized as assets. Generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) do not recognize a value of human capital nor much of the structural capital, such as internally developed software, patents, and brands. In developing the Statement, the FASB relied upon the four recognition criteria found in FASB Concept Statement No. 5, “Recognition and Measurement

in Financial Statements of Business Enterprises.” These criteria are: (1) The item meets the definition of an asset, (2) the item is measurable with sufficient reliability, (3) the information is capable of making a difference in decisions, and (4) the information indeed represents what it claims to represent, is verifiable, and is neutral.

As Bhasin (2011b) stated, “Since IC is a relatively new concept and there is no agreement on how to ‘measure it, many IC items will fail on criterion two (reliability in measurement) and criterion four (verifiability). Until these two criteria can be met, it is doubtful whether many intellectual assets will be included in financial statements. Additionally, there are no standards and/or generally accepted accounting policies for the IC accounts; the reliability of IC accounts depends on quality data and accumulation methods.” Thus, IC does not appear in the traditional FS. With the rise of the “knowledge economy” over the past 20 years, however, IC is becoming more important and should be disclosed. The various forms of IC disclosure provide valuable information for investors as they help reduce uncertainty about future prospects and facilitate a more precise valuation of the company. However, FS fail to reflect such a wide-range of value-creating IA, giving rise to increasing information asymmetry between firms and users, and creating inefficiencies in the resource allocation process within capital markets.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The main ICD studies were typically cross-sectional and country-specific, although some longitudinal studies have been reported too. Some of the leading ICD studies were conducted in Australia, UK & Ireland, Sweden, Canada, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, New Zealand, Bangladesh and India. While most studies employed “content analysis” as the research methodology, other studies have used questionnaire surveys (Beattie 2007). Despite the fact that the importance of IC has increased in recent times, there are inadequate disclosures of IC in the FS of companies (Bruggen et. al. 2009)

Bontis (1998) conducted an empirical pilot study that explores the development of several conceptual measures and models regarding IC and its impact on business performance through principal components analysis (PCA) and partial least squares (PLS) methods. Brennan and Connell (2000) examined substantial difference between company book value and market value, which indicates the presence of intellectual assets, not recognized and measured in company balance sheets and also provides guidelines to companies for reporting on IC. Kamath (2008) used the value added approach to a firm by its IC using a concept of value added intellectual coefficient (VAIC). However, Bhanawat (2008) measured the IC of companies by applying difference between market value and book value of firm. Further, Miguel Angel Axtle Ortiz (2009) analyzed various components of IC through a humanistic model called “contextual IC components valuation” model. A comparative study by Bhasin (2011) provided an insight into the style of IC disclosures done by the IT-sector corporations, both from India and Australia. The author conducted a comparative study of 16 Indian and 20 Australian companies, in which the ‘content analysis’ was performed on their annual reports. The results of study confirmed that “IC disclosure done by these companies from India and Australia were found to be low, mostly reported in a narrative form, and IC disclosure had not received any preference from the mentors of these corporations.” Singh and Kansal’s (2011) paper aims to investigate inter-firm IC disclosures and its variations in top 20 listed pharmaceutical companies in India, study the category wise and element wise IC disclosures (ICD), find out the impact of ICD on the creation of IC in monetary terms, find out correlation between IC valuation and its disclosure, and test significance of correlation Although top 20 companies of knowledge-led industry, “ICD are low, narrative and varying significantly among companies. ICD score varies in range of 4 to 36 against expected score of 96.” However, in another research work, Bhasin (2012) conducted a longitudinal study to analyze how Indian firms—Reliance Industries Limited, Balrampur Chini Mills, and Shree Cement Limited—measure and report their IC reports. The author also conducted a study of 16 Indian IT corporations by applying content analysis on the 2007 to 2009 annual reports. The results of this study confirmed that “IC disclosure in these IT corporations is almost negligible and its disclosure had not received any preference from the mentors of these corporations.” Similarly, Deep and Narwal (2014) analyzed the relationship of IC with financial performance measures of Indian textile sector for a period of 10 years using Value added intellectual

coefficient method. Dammak (2015) performed an empirical investigation to clarify the relationship between voluntary disclosure on the IC and firm valuation through content and factor analysis. Moreover, Bhatia and Agarwal (2015) conducted the study based on companies that went through IPO on BSE/NSE in the period 2011-12 using content analysis and by constructing an IC-related disclosure index.

Rodrigues et al., (2015, 2016), proposed a model to analyze the relationship between leadership, IC and their contribution to economic renewal. In second study, the author concludes, "IC disclosures are found to increase with company size, dual corporate governance models, industry, listing on sustainability indexes and increases in board size up to a maximum point (beyond which disclosures decrease). IC disclosures are reduced by CEO duality and by a higher proportion of independent directors on boards." Similarly, Dadashinasab et al., (2015) in their study investigated the IC performance and its association with financial performance of banks in Iran for the period 2007-12. Manolopoulou et al., (2015) examined the IC disclosure done by the Greek publicly traded firms implementing association and decision rules, using content analysis methodology. Bakar et al., (2015) examined the extent, nature and form of IC disclosure in the AR of 70 largest Malaysian companies. Gamayuni (2015) studied the relationship between intangible assets, financial policies and financial performance of companies in Indonesia. Lipunga (2015) measured the IC efficiency of the commercial banking sector of Malawi and Berzkalne et al., (2015) studies 65 Baltic listed companies from 2005 to 2011. In light of the above review of literature, an attempt has been made in present study to revisit the analysis of IC by market value added method. The purpose of a study is by Elis and Seng (2015) was to investigate the value relevance of voluntary intellectual capital disclosure (ICD) in New Zealand by examining the relationship between voluntary ICD and market value. The results suggest that the relationship between voluntary ICD and market value is not a simple, positive relationship across the board. The purpose of Ghosh and Maji (2015) study was to investigate empirically the validity of the basic propositions of value added intellectual coefficient (VAIC) and extend VAIC models in Indian knowledge-based sector. Using panel data relating to 62 firms from two Indian knowledge-based sectors, for a period of 10 years the study indicates that the VAIC model cannot be rejected as a technique of measuring intellectual capital.

Recently, Joshi et al., (2016) in their study examined the extent of IC disclosures and the determinants of such disclosures by the Malaysian companies by constructing disclosure index consisting of 20 items. The results revealed that the ICD level had increased as compared to the prior studies in Malaysia that suggests increased corporate awareness regarding ICD, though the disclosure level was lower as compared to the other advanced countries." Similarly, Ghorbel and Hela (2016) investigated the determinants of IC information's of Canadian firms that went through IPO by preparing a disclosure index. The results revealed that the managerial owner ship, the presence of an audit committee and industry are significantly associated with the voluntary disclosure of information about the IC in prospectuses. However, the purpose of a study by Baldini and Liberatore (2016) was to analyze the internal mechanisms of CG (board composition, role duality, ownership structure, auditor type and size of audit committee), which influence the IC disclosure in corporate annual reports for a sample of all listed Italian firms using content analysis by constructing disclosure index. Yang and Abeysekera (2016), attempted to examine whether disclosed intellectual capital (IC) can reflect a firm's financial performance and whether signals such as IC through annual reports are seen by investors as value-relevant signals for firm value evaluation. The purpose of Maji and Goswami (2016), study is to examine the impact of intellectual capital (IC) on Indian traditional sector and compare the relative importance of IC on corporate performance of Indian knowledge-based sector (engineering sector) and traditional sector (steel sector). The results indicate that IC efficiency and physical capital efficiency are positively and significantly associated with the firm performance for both the sectors.

The foregoing discussion suggests that the literature on the determinants of ICD in the Indian-context is very limited and inconclusive. Thus, our study builds on the previous literature of ICD practice and overall ICD scenario in the Indian corporate sector, especially pharmaceutical firms. The scope of the study has been confined to 8 companies and market value added (MVA) approach was used on their annual reports for five years, namely, 2005 and 2009, respectively.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study is an exploratory one and aims at two issues: (a) first, mapping the current state of IC disclosure scenario, and (b) second, attempt to measure the value of IC by the selected 8 companies in the Indian pharmaceutical industry during the 5 financial years 2005 to 2009. Accordingly, the sample-size of this study consists of the following companies: Aurobindo Pharma Limited, Aventis Pharma Limited, Cadila Limited, Cipla Limited, Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Limited, Novartis Limited, Sun Pharma Limited, and Torrent Limited. The two limitations of this study are: sample size is small and time period of study is also short. But we feel it will provide us a glimpse of the scenario, and help us to analyze and establish the trend of IC disclosure and measurement for the selected pharmaceutical companies from India.

The annual reports for the sample companies are collected from their respective corporate Web sites. The use of FS has been validated by several earlier research studies on ground of accessibility, consistency, timeliness and finally, it is an audited and comprehensive document, which is perceived to be more reliable than other documents. "Modified Intangible Assets Monitor" is used to capture the disclosure of elements of IC framework, as done by researchers in the past. The technique used for calculation of disclosure index is content analysis (Joshi et al., 2009). We are also going to use the five-point scale.

In order to attain the second objective, market value added approach (MVA), as a research methodology, is adopted for measuring the value of IC for the selected pharmaceutical companies in India. Moreover, under the present study, various statistical techniques are used to analyze the data. More specifically, the objectives of this part of the study are: first, to measure IC in monetary terms for the sample companies, second, to examine the relationship of IC and tangible assets with net operating profits, and third, to examine effectiveness of IC over tangible assets.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned earlier, this study aims at portraying the current state of the IC disclosure and measurement in the Indian scenario. Accordingly, "Modified Intangible Assets Monitor" is used to capture the disclosure of elements of IC framework, as done by researchers in the past. The technique used for calculation of disclosure index is content analysis (Bhasin, 2011, 2012, 2014; Joshi et al., 2010; Singh and Kansal, 2011). The five-point scale (0-4 score) has been applied in the following manner: No disclosures (0), Narrative disclosures (1), Quantitative disclosures (2), Monetary disclosures (3), Formula-based/comparative disclosures in statement form (4).

Table 1: Disclosure of IC by the Select Companies in 2008-09

S. No	Name of the Company	IC Disclosure Score	Ranking
1	Aurbindo Pharma Ltd.	19	3
2	Aventis Pharma Ltd.	22	2
3	Cadila Ltd.	07	7
4	Cipla Ltd.	04	8
5	Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Ltd.	28	1
6	Novartis Ltd.	08	6
7	Sun Pharma Ltd.	14	5
8	Torrent Ltd.	18	4
	Overall Average	15	
	Maximum Overall Score	96	

(Source: Compiled by the author based on annual reports of companies)

Table 1 provides a broad glimpse of the ICD scores of the 8 selected companies in 2008-09. A careful look at the data reveals that "first three top ICD scorers are: Dr. Reddy's (28), Aventis Pharma (22), and Aurbindo (19) and Torrent (18), respectively; thus, they get first, second and third ranks. However, the ICD score of three companies (viz., Novartis, Cadila and Cipla) is very poor and even below score of 10. Although, 8 listed companies of pharmaceutical sector in India have been taken in the study, IC disclosures vary among companies significantly. The highest and lowest ICD score values are 28 and 04, respectively with a substantial variation. Finally, the overall mean ICD score is 15 out of the total expected score of 96 (24 elements of IAM@4 points), which is drastically low and poor. In most of the cases, ICD are low,

narrative and vary significantly among companies. External capital is the most disclosed category. Brands and business collaborations is most disclosed element of IC, followed by employee competence and internal organizational capital respectively. ICD leads to creation of IC in some companies. Overall, correlation between IC valuation and disclosure is negative, weak and insignificant. The ICD made by some of the sample companies does not adequately fulfill the information needs of stakeholders, and hence companies need to disclose more meaningful information in their annual reports or in separate IC Reports.

Not surprisingly, this finding is in alignment/tune with some of the previous studies. For example, Sen and Sharma (2013) and Bhanawat (2008) attempted to measure and evaluate voluntary Intellectual Capital (IC) disclosures made by Indian pharmaceutical companies in their annual report. The content analysis has been used to measure the extent and nature of disclosure in sample companies with the help of 18 IC indicators across three broad categories, viz., structural capital elements, relational capital elements and human capital elements. From the study, it can be inferred that most of the reported IC attributes are expressed in discursive rather than numerical or monetary terms. The IC disclosure made by the sample companies does not adequately fulfil the informational needs of stakeholders, and hence companies need to disclose more meaningful information in their annual reports or in separate IC reports.” Similarly, Guthrie and Petty’s (2004) analysis of IC disclosure practices suggests that disclosure has been expressed in discursive rather than numerical terms and that little attempt has been made to translate the rhetoric into measures that enable performance of various forms of IC to be evaluated. The low level of disclosure in both developed and developing countries is testament to the fact that “IC as a concept has not been widely adopted practically.”

Let us examine the second objective of the study, namely, estimated value of measurement of IC in monetary terms. Therefore, market value added approach (MVA) as a research methodology is adopted for measuring IC of the eight Indian pharmaceutical companies during the study period. For the purpose of present research, IC is valued as the difference of market value (MV) and book value (BV). This method has already been used by several existing research studies in the past. The average of monthly highs and lows of market prices for the last 12 months is used to calculate the MV of the company. As described earlier, the estimated value of IC of all the 8 selected companies has been calculated by applying MVA approach. Thereafter, the relationship of the IC and tangible assets with the net operating profits (NOP) has been discussed in terms of coefficient of correlation. Last, but not the least, the effectiveness of IC over tangible assets has been examined through t-tests.

Table-2 shows the measurement of estimated value of IC of eight selected companies during the five years from 2005 to 2009. The following observations can be made: Keeping in view the computed value of IC, there has been widely fluctuating trend in the amount of IC during the entire period of study among all the pharmaceutical companies. The highest absolute ‘average’ amount of IC has been reported by the Sun Pharma Limited (rank 1), followed by Cipla Limited (rank 2), Aventis Pharma (rank 3), Torrent (rank 4), Novartis (rank 5), Cadila (rank 6), and Aurbindo Pharma (7).

Table-2: Estimated Value of Intellectual Capital for Selected Companies (Rs. in Crores)

Name of company	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Average	C.V.	Rank
Aurbindo Pharma Ltd.	305	-125	1163	369	-1464	50	1943	7
Aventis Pharma Ltd.	2564	3230	2408	1811	1267	2256	33	3
Cadila Ltd.	868	460	-68	-420	-101	148	346	6
Cipla Ltd.	1823	16361	4327	12618	11500	9326	65	2
Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories Ltd.	1021	1038	152	-1031	-1853	-134	-952	8
Novartis Ltd.	707	564	153	186	-53	311	101	5
Sun Pharma Ltd.	4751	5871	12203	15356	21809	11998	58	1
Torrent Ltd.	340	335	1159	861	138	567	75	4
Overall Average	1547	3467	2687	3719	3905	3065	209	
Coefficient of Variance (C.V.)	97.13	161.02	153.07	173.02	214.90	159.83		
High Value	4751	16361	12203	15356	21809	11998		
Low Value	305	-125	-68	-420	-53	-134		

(Source: Compiled from company annual reports by using MVA Method: IC= Market Value–Book Value, and by using average of market prices for the last 12 months.)

Surprisingly, Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories Limited was the only company from the sample, which created the least amount of IC (rank 8) as compared to other companies. It reported not only least amount of average IC but negative value (Rs. -134 crores). The Indian pharmaceutical sector reported “an overall average amount of IC of Rs. 3065 crores during 2004-05 to 2008-09.” There is considerable variation, both ups and downs, observed among the average amount of IC of selected companies during five years. Keeping in view the data shown in above Table, 2009 may be considered as very good year for the shareholders of Indian pharmaceutical sector because this year reported highest average amount of IC (Rs. 3,905 crores). By and large, an increasing trend in the average amount of IC, from 2005 to 2009, has been observed, except in 2007 with a marginal fall. The dispersion among the selected companies has been measured in terms of range, which comes to Rs. 12,132 crores. The biggest inconsistency has been noticed in the case of Aurbindo Pharma Limited, as it is evident by its highest coefficient of variation (1943). On the other extreme, least amount of fluctuation has been observed in Aventis Pharma Limited with lowest amount of coefficient of variation (C.V. 33). In other words, the performance of IC shown by Aventis Ltd. is more consistent during the entire period of study, with minor changes. Brennam and Connell (2000) noticed substantial difference between company book value and market value, which indicates the presence of intellectual assets, not recognized and measured in company balance sheets.

Table-3 depicts the Karl Pearson’s correlation analysis of IC and tangible assets (TA) with net operating profit, and then examines the relationship of IC and TA with net operating profit (NOP). It is amply clear from the results that “there is a ‘positive’ correlation between tangible assets of companies and net operating profit, while in majority of companies ‘negative’ correlation is found between IC and net operating profit.” One strong observation can be made here. Out of 8 companies selected, only two companies viz., Sun Pharma Limited (0.98, 0.98) and Cipla Limited (0.33, 0.92), have net operating profit positively correlated with both IC and tangible assets. In sharp contrast to this, all other companies are negatively correlated with IC and net operating profit. However, the overall average coefficient of correlation of IC and NOP is (-0.26), while the average coefficient of correlation of Tangible assets and NOP is (0.85) during the study period. Furthermore, Probable Error (PE) based test of significance has also been applied. It clearly reveals that significant correlation exists between tangible assets and net operating profit, while no significant correlation exists between IC and NOP.

Table-3: Correlation Analysis for the Selected Companies

Name of Company	Correlation value of Intellectual Capital and Net Operating Profit	Correlation value of Tangible Assets and Net Operating Profit
Aurbindo Pharma Ltd.	-0.67	0.74
Aventis Pharma Ltd.	-0.26	0.72
Cadila Ltd.	-0.72	0.93
Cipla Ltd.	0.33	0.92 (close correlation)
Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories Ltd.	-0.66	0.84
Novartis Ltd.	-0.96	0.92
Sun Pharma Ltd.	0.98	0.98 (perfect correlation)
Torrent Ltd.	-0.12	0.80
Overall Average	-0.26	0.85

(Source: Compiled by author from annual reports of companies)

The effectiveness of IC over tangible assets of selected companies is shown in above Table 4. It shows IC and tangible assets to market value expressed in terms of percentage. The inner brackets () in the above table represents tangible assets to market value in percentage. A careful perusal of the data reveals that the highest average percentage of IC to market value during the 5 years period of study is noticed in the following four companies: Sun Pharma Limited (78%), followed by Aventis Pharma Limited (74%), Novartis Pharma Limited (71%), and Cipla Limited (71%), respectively. Thus, Sun Pharma Limited, Aventis Pharma Limited get first and second rank, while two companies viz., Novartis Pharma Limited and Cipla Limited jointly

share the third rank. However, the negative IC to market value is reported by both Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Limited (-4%) and Aurbindo Pharma Limited (-7%). Overall, correlation between IC valuation and disclosure is negative, weak and insignificant.

After a careful look at **Table 4**, the following additional broad generalizations can be made. On an average basis, the overall pharmaceutical industry reported 41% of IC to market value, and 59% of tangible assets to market value. So, it very clearly indicates that tangible assets (TA) are more powerful as compared to IC. Moreover, on making a year-wise analysis, it is observed that there is a continuous declining trend in IC to market value ratio throughout the study period. For example, it declined from 52.00 in 2006, 47.37 in 2007, 36.00 in 2008 and finally, stands at 19.00 in 2009. However, a lone exception was in the year 2006 when the overall ratio slightly increased from 51.78 in 2005 to 52.00 in 2006. The highest IC to market value ratio is noticed in the year 2006 with 52%, while least ratio is noticed in the year 2009 with 19%. Further, the highest tangible asset to market value ratio is observed in the year 2009 with (81%) and the least in the year 2006 with (48%). Further, in order to examine the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between mean values of IC & T.A. to M.V. (in percentage); a t-test has also been administered. The calculated value of t-test is derived at (0.53) where table value at 5% level of significance at 14 d.f. is (2.15). So, our null hypothesis is accepted because calculated value is less than table value, which clearly indicates that there is no significant difference between % of IC and tangible assets to market value (MV). The small visible difference is only due to sampling fluctuations and not due to any major reason.

Table-4: Percentage of Intellectual Capital, Tangible Assets to Market Value

Name of Company	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Average	Rank
Aurbindo Pharma Ltd.	17(83%)	-8(108%)	35(65%)	11(89%)	-92(192%)	-7(107%)	7
Aventis Pharma Ltd.	84(16)	85(15)	77(23)	68(32)	58(32)	74(25)	2
Cadila Ltd.	47(53)	30(70)	-6(106)	-43(143)	-6(106)	4(95)	
Cipla Ltd.	54(46)	89(11)	63(37)	78(22)	72(28)	71(29)	3
Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Ltd.	31(69)	28(72)	5(95)	-37(137)	-47(147)	-4(104)	4
Novartis Ltd.	54(46)	90(10)	63(37)	78(22)	72(28)	71(107)	3
Sun Pharma Ltd.	79(21)	66(34)	79(21)	81(19)	83(17)	78(22)	1
Torrent Ltd.	49(51)	36(64)	63(37)	52(48)	12(88)	42(57)	5
Overall	51.87(48)	52.00(48)	47.37(53)	36.00(64)	19.00(81)	41(59)	6
High	84(16)	90(10)	79(21)	81(19)	83(17)		
Low	17(83)	-8(108)	-6(106)	-37(137)	-6(106)		

CONCLUSION

In today's knowledge-based economies, IC (in addition to financial and physical capital) plays a significant role in the value creation process of organizations. In a knowledge-intensive economy, a company's IC, whether it is derived from its employees, customer databases, or brands, undoubtedly contribute to a company's success and its ultimate value. Since knowledge is a source of competitive advantages, firms must develop their ability to measure, manage and disclose IC. It is argued that the success of many 21st century organizations lies in their ability to unlock and exploit their intellectual capital to obtain maximum "organizational advantage. Therefore, a common 'international' framework is needed for measuring, reporting and monitoring intangibles. Most of these intangible assets cannot be included within a company's balance sheet. Thus, IC disclosures in the FS have been largely voluntary. In the current scenario of financial reporting regime, investors are increasingly looking at the disclosure practices of companies. The companies also face capital market pressures and need to disclose more than the regulatory norm (Charumathi and Ramesh, 2015). There could be several motivations for the companies to disclose IC information voluntarily. "It is widely accepted that IC measurement and disclosure discussions have entered the corporate world, but review of the extant literature and previous studies reveals that IC, as a concept, has not

been widely adopted practically by the corporate sector,” said Bhasin (2015). In view of the increasing strategic importance of IC information, more and more organizations are shifting their focus to measurement, disclosure and management of IC, their most valuable assets. Unfortunately, IC is very difficult to measure and disclose both accurately and consistently, but its returns can be nearly infinite. Research till-date has yet to conclude how best to measure and disclose the IC. Current debates about IC are part of the search for a methodology to measure the knowledge base of a firm.

After some initial research on business and intangible resources in the Indian corporations, we found that three corporations had published their first IC reports in 1997, which were discontinued later on. These firms are: Balrampur Chini Mills Limited, Reliance Industries Limited, and Shree Cement Limited. However, there were vast differences in the disclosure mechanisms and methodologies followed by these Indian corporations. If you may recall, this study is an exploratory and aims at two issues: (a) first, mapping the current state of IC disclosure scenario, and (b) second, attempt to measure the value of IC by the selected 8 companies in the Indian pharmaceutical industry during the 5 financial years 2005 to 2009. To answer the first issue, we selected eight-listed companies from the pharmaceutical sector in India. MIAM is used to capture the disclosures. But as expected, IC disclosures are low and vary across these companies significantly. In most of the cases, ICD are low, narrative and vary significantly among companies. Furthermore, the above analysis reveals that the ICD among Indian pharmaceutical companies is very low. Not surprisingly, this finding is in alignment/tune with some of the previous studies. Recently, Joshi et al., (2016) concluded, “The results revealed that the IC disclosure level had increased as compared to the prior studies in Malaysia that suggests increased corporate awareness regarding IC disclosures, though the disclosure level was lower as compared to the other advanced countries. The results provided evidence that company size, leverage, and industry type significantly affected the intellectual capital disclosure levels.” For example, Guthrie and Petty’s (2004) analysis of IC disclosure practices suggests that disclosure has been expressed in discursive rather than numerical terms and that little attempt has been made to translate the rhetoric into measures that enable performance of various forms of IC to be evaluated. Similarly, Sen and Sharma (2013) in their study concluded as: “It can be inferred that most of the reported IC attributes are expressed in discursive rather than numerical or monetary terms.” The IC disclosure made by the sample companies does not adequately fulfil the informational needs of stakeholders, and hence companies need to disclose more meaningful information in their annual reports or in separate IC reports. No doubt, IC discussions and experimentation process has entered the corporate world but evidence published reveals that “IC as a concept has not been widely adopted practically. The low level of disclosure in developed as well as developing countries (like India), is testament to this fact.

Second, attempt is made to measure the estimated values of IC using MVA approach. There have been widely fluctuating trend in the amount of IC during the study period, across all eight companies. Brennan and Connell (2000) also noticed substantial differences between company book value and market value, which indicates the presence of intellectual assets, which are not recognized and measured in company balance sheets and also provides guidelines to companies for reporting on IC. Similarly, Tandon et al., (2016) have stated, “During the recent years, value of financial assets has grown exponentially when compared to physical assets indicating that intangibles are growing in importance in their contribution to economic growth. The evidence in support of this phenomenon can be found in the increasing gap between market and book valuation of firms.” As concluded by Singh and Kansal (2011), “The computed values of IC reveal that huge value of IC remains unreported in the balance sheet.” Because of lack of standardized accounting guidelines on this vital asset, resources worth thousands of millions go unreported in the annual reports thwarting the basic motive of true and fair view of financial statements.” Thus, IC measurement, reporting and disclosures in the emerging economy are still at a very nascent stage, especially in India. Though the awareness of the significance of IC disclosure is steadily improving over a period of time, the extent of disclosures is far behind the standards set by companies in developed economies (Kamath, 2015, 2015a). If the measurement and disclosure is made mandatory, then the stakeholders would get a clear picture about the true performance of the firms and would enable them towards better decision-making.

Recently, the FTI Consulting (2015) has announced the launch of its “Disclosure Index,” a report that tracks mandatory and voluntary disclosure practices amongst India’s leading publicly-listed corporations. When scored on a composite scale of 1 to 10, the “Indian Disclosure Index” revealed that only 41% of constituent companies of the BSE 100 index were fully compliant on ‘mandatory’ disclosure parameters. The report also revealed low levels of voluntary disclosure by Indian companies, with a median score of 3.5 (out of a maximum of six) with most providing inadequate information relating to business strategy and debt. Scores for strategy articulation and debt-related information are proxies for an opinion on management quality, a significant and subjective filter in the investment decisions of institutional investors. It is surprising that a large majority of BSE 100 index constituents did not articulate corporate strategy in sufficiently clear terms. This is also an indication of the currently-prevalent focus on financial metrics over non-financial ones. This is an area that needs to be revisited by Indian companies and their boards when finalizing their disclosure policy. Thus, on voluntary disclosure, Indian companies have a lot of work ahead of them to improve the manner in which management quality is perceived externally.

As Bhasin (2015) stressed, “It is necessary to develop a ‘new’ framework to identify, classify and calculate the value of IC. The International Accounting Standards Committee and its national counterparts face a challenge in setting local standards for IC measurement and disclosure. Few measurement and disclosure examples so far have been too firm-specific and no set of indicators could hope to be general enough to encompass the needs of a variety of international and industry settings.” Finally, we recommend that “a standard on IC accounting be issued by International Financial Reporting Committee (IFRC) to enable firm’s measure and record their IC values, as they relate to earnings per share in their income statement.” Auditing all of the different ICD frameworks at this point would be pointless. The adoption of ICD should be given due weightage in rating the companies. The disclosure of IC influences market price, therefore it may lead to improvement of rating of the companies as well, through enhancement of market capitalization. If companies realize the favorable relationship of ICD and market price, they shall be tempted to build more IC and disclose it. Voluntary disclosure is the only solution in the short-term. In the long-term, it will be up to the demands of the capital markets. If shareholders and analysts agree that IC disclosure is beneficial in explaining business performance, than companies will have no choice but to appease their audience. In the meantime, academic researchers must continue to push the envelope on empirically-based studies so as to support the growing number of early adopters.

REFERENCES:

- Abeysekera, I. (2007). Intellectual capital disclosing between a developing and developed nation. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 8(2), 329-345.
- Andriessen D. (2004). Intellectual capital valuation and measurement: classifying the state of the art. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 5(2), 230-242.
- Anuonye, N.B. (2015). IC Measurement: Using the earnings per share model of quoted insurance companies in Nigeria, *International Business and Management*, 10(1), 88-98.
- Bakar, R.A., Ishak, R. and Hasnah, K. (2015). IC Reporting: evidence from Malaysia. *Global Journal of Business and Social Science Review*, 1(1), 239-56.
- Baldini, M.A. and Liberatore, G. (2016). Corporate Governance and IC Disclosure: an empirical analysis of the Italian listed companies. *Corporate Ownership and Control*, 13(2), 187-201.
- Bernard, M., Dina, G. and Andy, N. (2003). Why do firms measure their intellectual capital? *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 4(4), 441-464.
- Berzkalne, I. and Zelgalve, E. (2014). Intellectual Capital and Company Value, *Science Direct, Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 110, 887-896.
- Bhasin, M.L. (2007). Intellectual Capital Reporting: The Challenge of Standardization and Harmonization. *Chartered Accountant*, June, 50(12), 1842-1858.
- Bhasin, M.L. (2008). Intellectual Capital Reporting at the Crossroads. *Paradigm*. 12(1), Jan.-June, 64-76.
- Bhasin, M.L. (2011). Disclosure of Intellectual Capital in Annual Reports: An Empirical Study of the Indian IT Corporations. *Modern Economy*, 2(4), 455-467.
- Bhasin, Madan and Shaikh, J.M. (2011a). Disclosure of Intellectual Capital in the Annual Reports by the IT Companies: An Exploratory Study of India. *International Journal of Managerial & Financial Accounting*, 3(2), 255-278.
- Bhasin, M.L. (2011b). Intellectual Capital Reporting Study of IT Sector Corporations in India, *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(1), 16-28.

- Bhasin, M.L. (2011c). Disclosure of Intellectual Capital in Annual Reports: An Exploratory Study of Indian IT Corporations. *Review of Economics & Finance*, 4(8), Aug., 63-73.
- Bhasin, M.L. (2012). Measurement and Disclosure of Intellectual Capital: Evidence from a Developing Country, *International Journal of Finance and Accounting*, Sept., 1(5), 82-93.
- Bhasin, M.L. (2012a). Intellectual Capital Disclosure Scenario: Evidence from a Developing Country, *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(9), Dec., 26-45.
- Bhasin, Madan (2014). Disclosure of Intellectual Capital in Annual Reports: Comparing Evidence from India and Australia, *International Journal of Management and Innovation*, 6(2), 103-125.
- Bhasin, Madan (2015). Voluntary Reporting of Intellectual Capital: Scenario of a Developing Economy. *British Journal of Research*, 2(6), 180-195.
- Bhasin, M.L. (2015a). Intellectual Capital Disclosure: Scenario of a Developing Economy. *Ciencia e Tecnica Vitivinicola Journal*, 30(12), Dec., 28-47.
- Bhasin, M.L. (2016). Voluntary Reporting of Corporate Governance Information in Annual Reports: An Empirical Study of an Asian Country, *International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research*, July, 5(7), 71-95.
- Bhasin, M.L. (2016a). Fraudulent Financial Reporting Practices: Case Study of Satyam Computer Limited. *The Journal of Economics, Marketing and Management*, 4(3), 12-24.
- Bhatia, M. and Agarwal, B. (2015). IC disclosures in IPO prospectuses of Indian companies, *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management*, 2(1), 40-51.
- Bhanawat, S.S. (2008). Indian Pharmaceutical Industry: Accounting and Disclosure Practices of Intellectual Property. *The Accounting World*, 29-35.
- Bontis, N., Chong Keow, W.C., Richardson, S. (2000). Intellectual Capital and Business Performance in Malaysian Industries, *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 1(1) 85-100.
- Brennan, N. and Connell, B. (2000), IC: Current Issues and Policy Implications, *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 1(3), 206-240.
- Bruggen, A., Vergauven, P., and Dao, M., (2009). Determinants of Intellectual Capital Reporting: Evidence from Australia, *Management Decision*. 47(2), 233-245.
- Bukh, P. N., Nielsen, C., Gormsen, P. and Mouritsen, J. (2005). Disclosure of information on intellectual capital in Danish IPO prospectuses. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 18(6), 713-732.
- Charumathi, B. and Ramesh, L. (2015). On the determinants of voluntary disclosure by Indian companies. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Management Research and Innovation*, June, 11(2), 108-116.
- Chiucchi M.S. (2008). Exploring the benefits of measuring intellectual capital. The Aimag case study, *Human Systems Management*, 27(3), 217-230.
- CIMA (2004). Understanding corporate value: managing and disclosing intellectual capital. Available at www.cima.org.
- Dadashinasab, M. Mousavi, S.A., Ghorbani, B. and Khatiri, M. (2015). IC Performance of financial institutions in Iran, *Walia Journal*, 31(S3), 56-60.
- Dammak, S. (2015). An analysis of the relationship between the voluntary disclosure of the IC and the firm value. *Management Science Letters*, 5(3), 271-288.
- Depoers, F. (2000). A Cost-benefit Study of Voluntary Disclosure: Some Empirical Evidence from French Listed Companies. *The European Accounting Review*, 9(2), 245-63.
- Deep and Narwal (2014). IC and its association with financial performance: a study of Indian textile sector. *International Journal of Managing Business Research*, 4(1), Winter, 43-54.
- Demartini, C. and Trucco, S. (2016). Does Intellectual Capital Disclosure Matter for Audit Risk? *Sustainability Journal*, 8(3), 867-866.
- Dumay, J. (2016). A critical reflection on the future of intellectual capital: from reporting to disclosure, *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 17(1), 168 – 184.
- Elis and Seng (2015). The Value Relevance of Voluntary IC Disclosure: New Zealand Evidence, *Corporate Ownership and Control*, 13(1),
- Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) (2001). Improving business reporting: insights into enhancing voluntary disclosure. Business Reporting Research Project. Steering Committee Report, Financial Accounting Standards Board, 1–50.
- FASB Statement (2001). Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No.142: Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets. Available at www.fasb.org.
- FASB Concept Statement No. 5, Recognition and Measurement in Financial Statements of Business Enterprises, FASB 1984. Available at www.fasb.org.
- FTI Consulting (2015). India Disclosure Index, available at www.fticonsulting.com.
- Gamayuni (2015). The effect of Intangible asset, financial performance and financial policies on the firm value. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 4(1), Jan., 202-212.
- Ghorbel, H. and Hela, E. (2016). Determinants of intellectual capital disclosure in initial public offerings: case of Canadian firms. *International Journal of Accounting and Economics Studies*, 4 (1), 52-59.
- Ghosh, S.K. and Maji, S.G. (2015). Empirical Validity of Value Added Intellectual Coefficient Model in Indian Knowledge-based Sector. *Global Business Review*, Dec. 16(6), 947-962.
- Guthrie J., Petty, R., Yongvanich, K. and Ricceri, F. (2004). Using content analysis as a research method to inquire into intellectual capital reporting, *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 5(2), 282–293.
- Heitman, W. (2016). Intangible Assets: They're Not What You Think They Are. CFO.com, July 19. Available at <http://ww2.cfo.com>.

- Joshi, M. and Ubha, D.S. (2009). Intellectual Capital Disclosures: The Search for a new Paradigm in Financial Disclosure by the Knowledge Sector of Indian Economy. *Electronic Journal of KM*, 7(5), 575-582.
- Kamath, B. (2008). Intellectual Capital Reporting in India: Content Analysis of Teck Firms. *Journal of Human Resource Costing and Accounting*, 12(3), 213-224.
- Kamath, G.B. (2015) IC Disclosure: Analysis of AR of Infosys Ltd., *Pacific Business Review International*, 7(7), Jan., 74-84.
- Kamath, G.B. (2015a). Impact of IC on financial performance and market valuation of firms in India, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 48(2), 107-22.
- Lipunga, A.M. (2015). Intellectual Capital performance of the commercial banking sector of Malawi. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 10 (1), 210-222.
- Maji, S.G. and Goswami, M. (2016). Intellectual capital and firm performance in emerging economies: the case of India. *Review of International Business and Strategy*, 26(3), 410 – 430.
- Manolopoulou, E., Kotsiantis, S. and Tzelepis, D. (2015). Application of association and decision rules on IC, *KM Research and Practice*, 13 May 225-234.
- McCann, David (2016). Intellectual Capital: The Hidden Talent Metric, Sept. Available at CFO.com.
- Oksana, L. and Inga, L. (2016). The transformation of the organization's intellectual capital: from resource to capital. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 17(4), 610 - 631
- Razak, R.A., Mohammad, J. and Tobiagi. S.M. (2016). Intellectual Capital Disclosures Practices and Intellectual Capital Performance in Saudi Arabia Financial Institution. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 7(4), 1-14.
- Rodrigues, H.S., Gupta, P. and Carlson, R. (2015). Exploiting Intellectual Capital for Economic Renewal. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, 7(1), March, 13-26.
- Rodrigues, L., Tejedo-Romero, F. & Craig, R. (2016). Corporate governance and IC reporting in a period of financial crisis: Evidence from Portugal. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, 15-60.
- Singh, S. and Kansal, M. (2011). Voluntary disclosures of intellectual capital: an empirical analysis. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 12(2), 301-318.
- Stathis, K.L. (2015). Ocean Tomo Releases 2015 Annual Study of Intangible Asset Market Value, available at <http://www.oceantomo.com>.
- Survilaite, S., Tamosiuniene, R. and Shatreovich, V. (2015). Intellectual Capital *Approach to modern management through the perspective of a company's value added*. *Business Theory and Practice*, 16(1), 31-44.
- Sveiby, K.E. (2004). Methods for Measuring Intangibles, available at www.sveiby.com.
- Tandon, K., Purohit, H. and Tandon, D., (2016). Measuring Intellectual Capital and Its Impact on Financial Performance: Empirical Evidence from CNX Nifty Companies, *Global Business Review*, 17(4), 980-997.
- Talukdar, A. (2008). What is Intellectual Capital? available at www.atainix.com.
- Uziene, L. and Stankute, E. (2015). Factors Influencing Intellectual Capital Measurement Practices, 20th International Scientific Conference Economics and Management-2015. Available at *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences* 213 (2015), 351–357.
- Yang, Y. and Abeysekera, I. (2016). Intellectual capital reporting and opportunistic underlying earnings disclosure of Australian listed firms, 2016 AFAANZ Conference. Available at <http://www.afaanz.org>.
- Zambon, S. and Monciardini, D. (2015). Intellectual Capital and Innovation: A Guide for Future Research. *Journal of Innovation Economics & Management*, 2(17), 13-26.