

A Comparative Study of Perceived Intellectual Capital Management Practices Across Demographic Groups in Indian B-Schools

¹**Manasee Behera**

Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Sambalpur University

²**Dr. Rohita Kumar Mishra**

Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Sambalpur University

Abstract:

Academic institutions currently depend heavily on the efficient management of intellectual capital (IC), especially in knowledge-intensive settings like Indian business schools (B-Schools). The purpose of this study is to look into how different demographic groups within Indian B-Schools perceive and apply Intellectual Capital Management (ICM) approaches. The study examines how demographic factors like age, gender, marital status, educational qualification and years of experience affect the comprehension and use of ICM practices. It does this by drawing on the tripartite framework of IC, which consists of Human Capital, Structural Capital, and Relational Capital. To evaluate statistically significant variations in ICM perception scores across demographic categories, a one-way ANOVA was used to analyze data from a structured questionnaire given to faculty members at a selection of Indian B-Schools. According to preliminary findings, perceptions of ICM are greatly influenced by demographic characteristics, especially in the areas of human and structural capital, such as years of teaching experience and academic designation. These results underline the necessity of inclusive, context-specific IC development methods that take into account the demographic variety found in educational institutions. By offering empirical insights into how demographic characteristics influence ICM perceptions in the context of Indian higher education, the study adds to the body of knowledge. It also provides practical suggestions for administrators and policymakers looking to improve intellectual capital frameworks in B-Schools.

Introduction:

The capacity of educational institutions to capture, manage, and utilize intellectual capital (IC) is more important than ever in the knowledge-driven economy of today. Particularly, business schools face increased pressure to promote innovation, research output, and the creation of strategic resources in addition to providing high-quality instruction

(Nikolaichuk et al., 2019). The term "intellectual capital management" (ICM) refers to the methodical administration of intangible assets, including relational capital (external connections with industry, alumni, and academic networks), structural capital (processes, databases, and organizational culture), and human capital (knowledge, competencies, and skills of faculty and staff). Together, these factors support B-schools' competitive posture and long-term viability. Institutions may implement a variety of ICM methods, but depending on a number of internal circumstances, such as the demographics of its stakeholders, the perception and efficacy of these practices can differ greatly (Parthenope et al., 2019).

Examining how these demographic factors affect the perception and uptake of ICM practices is crucial in Indian B-schools, where there is a significant variance in faculty and administrators' gender, age, designation, years of experience, and educational backgrounds. In this sense, perceptions are important markers of how successfully ICM tactics are comprehended, embraced, and incorporated into regular administrative and academic activities (Garcia-perez et al., 2020). While more seasoned staff members may place greater importance on institutional memory and conventional knowledge-sharing frameworks, younger faculty members may have a more technological perspective on ICM, stressing digital platforms and innovation. Similar distinctions may be seen in the ways that intellectual capital is valued, created, and used between academic and administrative personnel, as well as between male and female academics (Secundo, Passiante, et al., 2015).

Even with the increased scholarly interest in knowledge management and intellectual capital in higher education, there is still a dearth of empirical research on Indian B-schools, particularly when it comes to studies that compare the perception of ICM practices with demographic diversity (Hoang et al., 2020). In order to close that gap, this study compares the perspectives of different demographic groups within Indian B-schools regarding the application and effects of intellectual capital management. In order to find trends and insights that help direct more inclusive and successful intellectual capital policies, this research will use statistical tools like ANOVA to assess variation across demographic categories (Teimouri et al., 2017).

Understanding the organizational dynamics and underlying reasons that influence perceptual differences is just as important as identifying them. The results can help B-school leadership create customized rules, enhance procedures for exchanging knowledge, and foster a more harmonious intellectual environment (Secundo, Passiante, et al., 2015). Understanding the complex relationship between demographic diversity and ICM can be a strategic advantage for institutional excellence and sustainability in the quickly changing

academic landscape, where stakeholders and accrediting agencies expect accountability, innovation, and quality (Castro et al., 2019).

IC primarily comprises of three important components: human capital, structural capital and relational capital (Costa & Santos, 2020).

Importance of Intellectual capital management in Indian B-Schools:

Indian B-Schools' operational and academic excellence is greatly influenced by intellectual capital management, or ICM (Iacuzzi et al., 2020). Intellectual capital, which comprises relational capital (industry connections, alumni networks), structural capital (institutional procedures, curricula, databases), and human capital (faculty competence, student talents), is a crucial strategic asset in today's knowledge-driven economy (Stauf & Horeth, 2020). In order to improve the general caliber of instruction and research output, effective ICM makes sure that these intangible resources are created, used, and maintained to their full potential. Effectively managing intellectual capital has become essential for B-Schools to stay relevant, competitive, and inventive in light of rising global competition and accrediting criteria (Kohnová & Papula, 2020).

The most important element is human capital, which includes faculty and student knowledge, abilities, and competencies (Samaibekova et al., 2019). Hiring highly skilled teachers, encouraging research, and supporting ongoing development are becoming more and more important to Indian B-Schools (Kehle et al., 2018). Institutions may foster a culture of creativity, mentoring, and critical thinking by effectively managing their human resources, which enhances academic delivery and student outcomes. Knowledge-sharing platforms, performance reviews, and structured training all aid in maintaining and expanding this talent pool (Danvila-del-Valle et al., 2019).

Systems, rules, intellectual property, and organizational culture are all components of structural capital, which guarantees the longevity and expandability of institutional knowledge (Svistunov et al., 2019). Effective structural capital management at B-Schools promotes curriculum innovation, efficient administration, and the uptake of contemporary teaching methods like case-based learning and digital learning platforms. This enhances academic delivery while also boosting the institution's standing and efficiency (Nevado-Peña et al., 2015).

Placement, internships, live projects, and cooperative research all depend on relational capital, which is the networks that B-Schools have with industry, alumni, regulatory agencies, and foreign partners (Kasztler & Leitner, 2002). B-Schools may increase their impact and draw in better prospects for both staff and students by forming strategic alliances and developing their brands. Institutions may cultivate these connections and turn them into long-term value by using appropriate ICM procedures (Stachová et al., 2019).

For Indian B-Schools, intellectual capital management is a strategic requirement rather than merely a theoretical idea (Kramin et al., 2015). It improves their capacity to innovate, adapt to change, provide high-quality instruction, and create a long-lasting competitive edge. ICM offers a strong framework that enables B-Schools to meet local demands while adhering to international standards in the framework of India's ambition to become a worldwide center for education (Huang et al., 2021).

Hypothesis:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in the attitude of gender of employees and research scholars towards ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.

H₀₂: Age has no significant role for the contribution of intellectual capital management in Indian B-Schools.

H₀₃: Marital status of the employees and research scholars has no effect on ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.

H₀₄: Educational qualifications of the employees and research scholars have no impact on ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.

H₀₅: Work experience of the employees and research scholars does not have a significant effect on employee's attitude towards ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.

Review of Literature:

Overview of Intellectual Capital Management:

The term "intellectual capital" (IC) describes an organization's intangible resources that generate value and performance. According to Stewart (1997) and Edvinsson & Malone (1997), it can be broadly divided into three dimensions: relational capital, structural capital, and human capital. In order to improve institutional effectiveness, intellectual capital management procedures include gathering, assessing, and utilizing these intangible resources. The quality of instruction, research output, stakeholder satisfaction, and brand reputation are all significantly impacted by intellectual capital in the setting of educational institutions, particularly business schools (B-Schools) (Ramirez & Gordillo, 2014).

Higher Education's Use of Intellectual Capital:

The increasing significance of IC in academic contexts has been highlighted by a number of researches. According to Leitner (2004), universities are increasingly seen as knowledge-intensive institutions where innovation and competitiveness are largely dependent on intellectual resources. Long-term academic success depends on the efficient administration of institutional procedures (structural capital), industry cooperation (relational capital), and faculty knowledge (human capital). IC management is becoming even more important as India's higher education system, especially B-Schools, is changing to meet international standards (Sengupta & Sinha, 2005).

Intellectual capital management perceptions:

Stakeholders' opinions on IC management techniques can differ greatly. Academic freedom and knowledge exchange may be more important to faculty members than to administrators, who might concentrate on process optimization and stakeholder involvement (Kong & Prior, 2008). The success of IC projects is frequently impacted by this perception disparity. According to Warden (2003), demographic variables like age, gender, academic standing, work experience, and institutional type (public vs. private) are also likely to cause perception-based differences.

The importance of ICM in B-Schools in India has grown in importance due to the growing competition for international accreditations, rankings, and industry partnerships (Bontis, 2001). The use of ICM at academic institutions is still unequal, nevertheless, and is frequently impacted by faculty involvement, leadership commitment, and institutional type (private vs. public) (Subramaniam & Youndt, 2005).

Human Capital: The most important element in academic environments is thought to be human capital. Faculty experience, research output, and instructional efficacy are important factors that determine intellectual capital in educational institutions, according to Bontis (1998). Indian B-Schools differ greatly in how they invest in and develop their faculty, which frequently affects student performance and the school's reputation (Ramachandran, 2008).

Structural Capital: The foundation of knowledge transfer at B-Schools is structural capital, which includes academic procedures, technology infrastructure, and quality assurance methods. Institutions that successfully use structural capital experience increased operational effectiveness and creativity, claim Sharabati et al. (2010).

Relational Capital: Employability and industry relevance are significantly impacted by relational capital, which is characterized by partnerships, alumni relations, and business ties. B-Schools with robust relational networks are better equipped to close the gap between academia and industry, according to studies like those conducted by Wang and Chang (2005).

There aren't many comparative studies conducted in India. But when Joshi and Ubha (2009) contrasted government and private institutions, they discovered that public B-Schools tend to lead in structural and human capital because of their experienced faculty and heritage systems, whereas private B-Schools tend to outperform in relational capital because of their strong industry engagement.

Furthermore, different stakeholders have different opinions about ICM. While administrators place more emphasis on rankings and performance metrics, faculty may place a higher priority on research and academic freedom. Therefore, a sophisticated comprehension of perceived ICM is necessary for both institutional benchmarking and efficient policymaking. With a multifaceted framework based on intellectual capital theory, this study attempts to close the gap by examining comparative views on ICM across different Indian B-Schools.

Impact of Demographics on IC Management Procedures:

A growing corpus of research examines how perceptions of IC and knowledge sharing behavior are influenced by demographic diversity:

Gender Differences: Research indicates that male and female scholars may have different perspectives on perceived obstacles to IC development, knowledge sharing, and teamwork (Renzl et al., 2006).

Age and Experience: According to Kianto et al. (2014), senior faculty members may have more institutional knowledge but may be less involved with more recent IC techniques like innovation networks or digital knowledge repositories.

Institutional Differences: While public B-Schools may lag behind in formalization, private institutions may implement more aggressive IC management measures as a result of performance demands (Youndt et al., 2004).

The Indian B-School Context of Intellectual Capital:

Despite increased interest, there is currently little empirical research on IC in Indian B-Schools. Bontis et al. (2000) emphasized the necessity of IC metrics in developing nations. Indian B-Schools frequently lack formal IC frameworks, despite placing a strong emphasis on industry connections and faculty qualifications (Sharma & Sharma, 2010). There are clear variations in IC practices among Indian B-Schools according to institutional governance and resource availability.

Research Gaps Found:

Limited empirical studies on demographic differences in IC perceptions in Indian B-Schools; absence of comparative frameworks that account for intergroup differences (e.g., male vs. female, junior vs. senior faculty); and need for localized metrics and models appropriate for the Indian academic setting.

IC with competitive advantage in Indian B-Schools:

Particularly in knowledge-intensive industries like higher education, intellectual capital (IC) has become a crucial intangible asset that greatly adds to an institution's long-term competitive advantage. Bontis (1998) asserts that IC is made up of relational, structural, and human capital, all of which work in concert to improve an institution's capacity for innovation, adaptation, and value generation. IC is crucial in determining academic excellence, brand recognition, and institutional performance in the context of Indian B-Schools. Indian management institutes that proactively manage their IC have a higher chance of gaining stakeholder trust and international reputation, according to Yallapragada and Bhuiyan (2011). Furthermore, Subramaniam and Youndt (2005) contend that the foundation of competitive differentiation in educational institutions is human capital, which is demonstrated by the caliber of professors, student talent, and leadership.

Leading Indian B-Schools that invest in structural capital (such as research infrastructure, digital learning platforms, and governance frameworks) are better positioned to produce long-term academic results and draw in corporate partnerships, according to empirical studies like those by Kamath (2008). Furthermore, relational capital strengthens long-term competitiveness by increasing visibility and knowledge transfer. Examples of this include alumni networks, industrial partnerships, and international connections (Edvinsson & Malone, 1997; Gupta & Singh, 2013). Overall, the incorporation of IC elements promotes strategic positioning, innovation, and high-quality education delivery, allowing Indian B-Schools to maintain their competitiveness in an increasingly globalized educational environment.

IC with sustainable development in Indian B-Schools:

In recent years, scholarly interest in the role of intellectual capital (IC) in fostering the long-term growth of Indian B-Schools has grown. The foundation for improving institutional performance, innovation, and competitive advantage is intellectual capital, which includes relational, structural, and human capital (Edvinsson & Malone, 1997). Important components of IC that support sustainability objectives in the Indian B-School context are the recruitment and retention of top-notch professors, efficient knowledge management systems, and tactical industry-academia collaborations. Strong intellectual capital makes educational institutions more capable of adjusting to changing educational environments and societal demands, according to researchers like Bontis (2001) and Youndt et al. (2004). In India, B-Schools are being assessed more and more on their contributions to sustainable education and ethical management techniques, in addition to their infrastructure and placement rates (Kumar & Dash, 2019). Aspects of intellectual capital are also indirectly reflected in the National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF), which has categories like "Teaching, Learning & Resources" and "Research and Professional Practice." Research by Ramakrishnan (2020) and Joshi et al. (2013) contend that incorporating sustainability into business education necessitates using intellectual capital to create institutional culture, pedagogy, and curricula that promote long-term socioeconomic and environmental results. However, obstacles including administrative inertia, a lack of research that is in line with industry and faculty attrition still prevent IC from reaching its full potential in promoting sustainable development. As a result, Indian B-Schools hoping to meet international standards for sustainable education must strategically concentrate on assessing, controlling, and disclosing intellectual capital.

Research Methodology:

The research approach that will be applied in this study is detailed in this chapter. Both the population and the study's design are discussed. The tools to be utilized for data collection and the techniques to be applied for data analysis are also discussed.

Research Design:

To achieve the project's goals, this research is being done to gather both primary and secondary data. The research is both exploratory and descriptive in nature. While descriptive or statistical research gives information about the population or universe being examined, exploratory research is undertaken to address an issue that has not yet been precisely characterized. When gathering data on people's views, opinions, behaviours, or any other range of educational or societal difficulties, etc., this methodology is ideal. The study was conducted at Indian B-Schools using this approach of information gathering, which involves interviewing or giving a questionnaire to a sample of people in order to make conclusions and obtain complete knowledge and to meet the stated objectives.

Scope:

The current study's focus is solely on Indian B-School's assessment of intellectual capital management using a multi-criteria approach.

Data Source:

The information for the study has been gathered from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data were acquired through structured questionnaires, and secondary data came from official websites, journals, publications, etc.

Method of Data Collection:

Indian B-Schools teaching faculty and research scholars were given standardized questionnaires to complete in order to collect the data. A total of 130 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents, and 113 were deemed complete enough to be used in the study.

Sampling and data collection:

To gather the information for the study, a questionnaire was created. Five people from Indian B-Schools took the survey as a trial project. It was altered prior to administration as a result of the pilot test.

Sample size:

Out of a total of 130 questionnaires that were disseminated due to time and accessibility restrictions, 120 questionnaires were actually received from various Indian B-Schools. The investigation was carried out using 113 genuine questionnaires that were selected from this population.

Research instruments:

The main tool for this study is questionnaire. The questionnaire aims to gather information about respondent's demographic background, perception regarding the ICM in Indian B-Schools.

Method of data analysis:

The information gathered from the questionnaire responses is examined. One way ANOVA is the primary statistical technique used in this study (In SPSS-26 Version).

Sample Size and proportionate representation of population:

Population on the basis of gender

(Table No-1)

Male	Female	N (Population size)
61	52	113

One-Way ANOVA:

Table No-1: ANOVA on the attitude of gender of the employees and research scholars with regard to ICM:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in the attitude of gender of employees and research scholars towards ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.

Dimensions of ICM		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significant Value (p)
Intellectual Property Human Capital	Between Groups	2.305	1	2.305	1.655	.201
	Within Groups	154.597	111	1.393		
	Total	156.903	112			

Intellectual Property Structural Capital	Between Groups	.850	1	.850	.436	.510
	Within Groups	216.212	111	1.948		
	Total	217.062	112			
Intellectual Property Relational Capital	Between Groups	2.215	1	2.215	1.528	.219
	Within Groups	160.847	111	1.449		
	Total	163.062	112			
Core processes Education and continuing Education	Between Groups	2.387	1	2.387	1.646	.202
	Within Groups	160.976	111	1.450		
	Total	163.363	112			
Core processes Research & Development	Between Groups	7.044	1	7.044	4.800	.031
	Within Groups	162.885	111	1.467		
	Total	169.929	112			
Output and impact of core processes Education and continuing Education & Research and Development	Between Groups	1.689	1	1.689	1.191	.277
	Within Groups	157.373	111	1.418		
	Total	159.062	112			

Interpretation:

The above Table No.1 shows that the five dimensions out of six of ICM containing the Sig. or p-value values as more than 0.05 i.e. the values are 0.201, 0.510, 0.219, 0.202 and 0.277 respectively at 5% level of significance. As the p-value is more than 0.05, it leads to the acceptance of H_{01} : ***There is no significant difference in the attitude of gender of employees and research scholars towards ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.*** This implies that there is no significant difference in the attitude of employees towards the gender of the employees and research scholars.

Table-2: ANOVA on the attitude of age of the employees and the research scholars with regard to ICM:

H₀₂: Age has no significant role for the contribution of intellectual capital management in Indian B-Schools.

Dimensions of ICM		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significant Value (p)
Intellectual Property Human Capital –	Between Groups	16.407	3	5.469	3.392	.021
	Within Groups	175.752	109	1.612		
	Total	192.159	112			
Intellectual Property Structural Capital –	Between Groups	14.528	3	4.843	3.397	.020
	Within Groups	155.401	109	1.426		
	Total	169.929	112			
Intellectual Property Relational Capital –	Between Groups	15.870	1	15.870	9.992	.002
	Within Groups	176.290	111	1.588		
	Total	192.159	112			
Core processes – Education and continuing Education	Between Groups	4.235	1	4.235	2.888	.092
	Within Groups	162.774	111	1.466		
	Total	167.009	112			
Core processes – Research & Development	Between Groups	8.810	1	8.810	5.681	.019
	Within Groups	172.128	111	1.551		
	Total	180.938	112			
Output and impact of core processes – Education and continuing Education & Research and Development	Between Groups	6.947	1	6.947	4.079	.046
	Within Groups	189.071	111	1.703		
	Total	196.018	112			

Interpretation:

The above Table No.2 shows that the five dimensions out of six of ICM containing the Sig. or p-value values as less than 0.05 i.e. the values are 0.021, 0.020, 0.002, 0.019 and 0.046 respectively at 5% level of significance. As the p-value is less than 0.05, it leads to the rejection of *H₀₂: Age has no significant role for the contribution of intellectual capital management in Indian B-Schools.* This implies that there is a significant difference in the attitude of employees towards the age of the employees & the research scholars.

Table-3: ANOVA on the attitude of marital status of the employees with regard to ICM:

H₀₃: Marital status of the employees and research scholars has no effect on ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.

Dimensions of ICM		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significant Value (p)
Intellectual Property Human Capital	Between Groups	3.941	1	3.941	2.860	.094
	Within Groups	152.961	111	1.378		
	Total	156.903	112			
Intellectual Property Structural Capital	Between Groups	.320	1	.320	.164	.687
	Within Groups	216.742	111	1.953		
	Total	217.062	112			
Intellectual Property Relational Capital	Between Groups	.005	1	.005	.003	.956
	Within Groups	163.057	111	1.469		
	Total	163.062	112			
Core processes – Education and continuing Education	Between Groups	.386	1	.386	.263	.609
	Within Groups	162.977	111	1.468		
	Total	163.363	112			
Core processes – Research & Development	Between Groups	1.080	1	1.080	.682	.411
	Within Groups	175.787	111	1.584		
	Total	176.867	112			
Output and impact of core	Between Groups	.077	1	.077	.054	.817

processes – Education and continuing Education & Research and Development						
	Within Groups	158.985	111	1.432		
	Total	159.062	112			

Interpretation:

The above Table No.3 shows that the all six dimensions out of six of ICM containing the Sig. or p-value values as more than 0.05 i.e. the values are 0.094, 0.687, 0.956, 0.609, 0.411 and 0.817 respectively at 5% level of significance. As the p-value is more than 0.05, it leads to the acceptance of H_{03} : ***Marital status of the employees and research scholars has no effect on ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.*** This implies that there is no significant difference in the attitude of employees towards the marital status of the employees & the research scholars.

Table-4: ANOVA on the attitude of educational qualification of the employees with regard to ICM:

H_{04} : Educational qualifications of the employees and research scholars have no impact on ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.

Dimensions of ICM		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significant Value (p)
Intellectual Property Human Capital	Between Groups	21.891	4	5.473	4.309	.003
	Within Groups	137.171	108	1.270		
	Total	159.062	112			
Intellectual Property Structural Capital	Between Groups	10.978	4	2.744	2.301	.043
	Within Groups	128.828	108	1.193		
	Total	139.805	112			
Intellectual Property Relational Capital	Between Groups	13.829	4	3.457	2.438	.051
	Within Groups	153.180	108	1.418		
	Total	167.009	112			

Core processes – Education and continuing Education	Between Groups	12.957	4	3.239	2.229	.031
	Within Groups	156.972	108	1.453		
	Total	169.929	112			
Core processes – Research & Development	Between Groups	76.149	4	19.037	14.591	.001
	Within Groups	140.913	108	1.305		
	Total	217.062	112			
Output and impact of core processes – Education and continuing Education & Research and Development	Between Groups	14.528	3	4.843	3.397	.020
	Within Groups	155.401	109	1.426		
	Total	169.929	112			

Interpretation:

The above Table No.4 shows that the five dimensions out of six of ICM containing the Sig. or p-value values as less than 0.05 i.e. the values are 0.003, 0.043, 0.031, 0.001 and 0.020 respectively at 5% level of significance. As the p-value is less than 0.05, it leads to the rejection of ***H₀₄: Educational qualifications of the employees and research scholars have no impact on ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.*** This implies that there is a significant difference in the attitude of employees and research scholars towards the Educational qualifications.

Table-5: ANOVA on the attitude of experience of the employees with regard to ICM:

H₀₅: Work experience of the employees and research scholars does not have a significant effect on employee's attitude towards ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.

Dimensions of ICM		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significant Value (p)
Intellectual Property	Between Groups	7.038	3	2.346	1.488	.022
	Within Groups	171.847	109	1.577		

Human Capital	Total	178.885	112			
Intellectual Property Structural Capital	Between Groups	1.567	1	1.567	1.247	.267
	Within Groups	139.565	111	1.257		
	Total	141.133	112			
Intellectual Property Relational Capital	Between Groups	1.549	1	1.549	1.261	.264
	Within Groups	136.310	111	1.228		
	Total	137.858	112			
Core processes – Education and continuing Education	Between Groups	3.941	1	3.941	2.860	.044
	Within Groups	152.961	111	1.378		
	Total	156.903	112			
Core processes – Research & Development	Between Groups	63.379	3	21.126	14.984	.030
	Within Groups	153.683	109	1.410		
	Total	217.062	112			
Output and impact of core processes – Education and continuing Education & Research and Development	Between Groups	8.810	1	8.810	5.681	.019
	Within Groups	172.128	111	1.551		
	Total	180.938	112			

Interpretation:

The above Table No.5 shows that the four items out of six items of ICM containing the Sig. or p-value values as less than 0.05 i.e. the values are 0.022, 0.044, 0.030 and 0.019 respectively at 5% level of significance. As the p-value is less than 0.05, it leads to the rejection of H_0 : ***Work experience of the employees and research scholars does not have a significant effect on employee's attitude towards ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.*** This implies that there is a significant difference in the attitude of employees towards the experience of the employees.

Major findings and Suggestions

This chapter deals with the major findings, conclusions and suggestions based on the chapter seven and chapter eight.

Table-: Hypotheses wise findings:

Hypothesis No.	Hypotheses	Result	Interpretation	Implication
H ₀₁	There is no significant difference in the attitude of gender of employees and research scholars towards ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.	H ₀ Hypothesis accepted	There is no significant difference in the attitude of gender of employees and research scholars towards ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.	Indian B-Schools need to give more focus on the recruitment programs which are required to reduce the workload.
H ₀₂	Age has no significant role for the contribution of intellectual capital management in Indian B-Schools.	H ₀ Hypothesis rejected	Age has no significant role for the contribution of intellectual capital management in Indian B-Schools.	Indian B-Schools need to focus and provide more importance on personal growth of the employees.

H ₀₃	Marital status of the employees and research scholars has no effect on ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.	H ₀ Hypothesis accepted	Marital status of the employees and research scholars has no effect on ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.	Indian B-Schools need to focus the satisfaction level of employees.
H ₀₄	Educational qualifications of the employees and research scholars have no impact on ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.	H ₀ Hypothesis rejected	Educational qualifications of the employees and research scholars have no impact on ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.	Indian B-Schools need to focus on assigning the job according to the qualification and skills
H ₀₅	Work experience of the employees and research scholars does not have a significant effect on employee's attitude towards ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.	H ₀ Hypothesis rejected	Work experience of the employees and research scholars does not have a significant effect on employee's attitude towards ICM practices in Indian B-Schools.	Indian B-Schools need to provide the authority & power in certain cases

Objective wise findings:

Significant differences exist in the ways that different stakeholders assess the efficacy and application of Intellectual Capital Management (ICM) methods, according to a comparative study of ICM practices across different demographic groups in Indian B-Schools. According to a gender-wise analysis, female respondents frequently highlighted inclusive decision-making and collaborative knowledge environments, suggesting a

nuanced approach to the creation of intellectual capital. Furthermore, respondents from public institutions thought their ICM frameworks were stronger than those from private B-Schools, indicating that capital development may be influenced by existing governance structures and policy consistency. Last but not least, regional differences were found, with metropolitan B-Schools reporting more sophisticated digital information-sharing platforms and knowledge repositories. This shows the importance of exposure and infrastructure in influencing ICM views. These results highlight the necessity of customized, situation-specific ICM approaches that complement the demographic variety of Indian B-Schools. It is also seen that the effective intellectual capital management practices are necessary for the individual and the institutional growth, which was evidenced from the **Review of Literature**. Also, the employees of the age group of 20-30 years have a significant influence on intellectual capital management apparently because of their concern for own career. It was evidenced from the **testing of one way ANOVA** from Hypothesis testing i.e. **H₀₂: Age has no significant role for the contribution of intellectual capital management in Indian B-Schools**, which is found to be rejected, that means age has a significant role for the contribution of intellectual capital management in Indian B-Schools. Generally speaking, faculty members with more than ten years of experience had a more favorable opinion of relational and structural capital activities, suggesting a deeper comprehension of institutional knowledge-sharing processes. On the other hand, younger faculty and administrative personnel tended to pay more attention to aspects of human resources, including hiring procedures and professional development.

Suggestions:

The following suggestions may be offered:

1. As Intellectual Capital Management is found to be a way for organizations to manage their human capital, structural capital and relational capital into a strategic asset. There is a need of identifying the ways to retain the best talents by strategic capabilities.
2. The young masses of Indian B-Schools are more concerned about developing their own career. The University needs to create career development opportunities of the employees and research scholars by providing effective facilities such as training and development, conducting career development programs and influencing for higher education.
3. There is a need of providing motivational facilities which creates encouragement among the workers.
4. The job stress of employees in Indian B-Schools is increasing day by day due to slow recruitment process. So, there is a requirement of minimizing the job stress by adopting new and advance technologies also by doing regular recruitment processes.

5. There is a requirement of placing of right people to right job according to their qualifications, knowledge and skills.
6. There is a need of effective intellectual capital management practices and implementation of effective strategies in Indian B-Schools for the individual and the organizational growth.

Conclusion:

In the actual stage of knowledge era, educational institutions need to gain and maintain their competitive advantage and one of the feasible ways is through their Intellectual Capital Management, which is the root of all institutional activities (Lapygin & Makarov, 2019). As Intellectual capital is one of the most crucial management functions, Indian B-Schools need to take action to close its gaps, such as timely recruitment and selection, task assignment for the right people in the right jobs, adoption of new technology for easy and timely work to be done, etc., and ensure that the processes involved are properly followed (Wudhikarn, 2018). The success of institutions strongly depends on the way they manage all facets of knowledge and skills that creates value and give the sustainable competitive advantage (Matos et al., 2018). Therefore, to cope up with innovation and competitiveness, identifying, measuring, and managing intellectual capital is essential for Indian B-Schools.

The ability to find, keep, and develop the most talented workers on the educational institutions especially in Indian B-Schools is a key component of effective intellectual capital management (Wang, 2022). Again, the study's findings imply that Indian B-Schools staff members and the research scholars who understood the necessity for a mindset shift and desired formal education in order to keep up with contemporary technology advancements financed themselves to learn these abilities (Wudhikarn & Pongpatcharatorntep, 2022).

Research limitations:

The survey was conducted in a single university, namely Indian B-Schools, and it was limited to this region alone. Collecting data from the faculty members and research researchers was challenging due to their busy schedules. The study was completed within a constrained time period. Additionally, the study's sample size was too small to permit the use of any complex statistical analysis; hence, additional research is needed to understand more about the relationships between HRM and ICM in different other educational institutions and universities.

Possibilities for future research:

1. Further research of similar kind may be conducted by taking different other B-Schools in India (Government, Private and Autonomous Institutions etc.) present in Odisha and India will add value to the kind of study which may be tried in future research.
2. Future research should compare each aspect of green IC—green human, green structural, and green relational capital—with the six aspects of green HRM (green recruitment, selection, training, performance management, pay & reward, and involvement) in order to take sustainability, performance, and competitive advantage into account.
3. Scientific research may continue to look into whether there will be any relationship between IC & SD to assist the “Sustainable Growth” program.
4. Integrating other aspects of Intellectual Capital such as, reputation, decision making processes, and cultural elements requires additional research.

References:

- Bontis, N. (2000). *Assessing knowledge assets: A review of the models used to measure intellectual capital*. International Journal of Management Reviews, 3(1), 41–60.
- Bontis, N. (2001). *Assessing knowledge assets: a review of the models used to measure intellectual capital*. International Journal of Management Reviews, 3(1), 41–60.
- Edvinsson, L., & Malone, M. S. (1997). *Intellectual Capital: Realizing Your Company's True Value by Finding Its Hidden Brainpower*. Harper Business.
- Gupta, V., & Singh, S. (2020). *Role of intellectual capital in developing sustainable competitive advantage in Indian business schools*. Journal of Knowledge Management, 24(4), 765–782.
- Joshi, M., Cahill, D., & Sidhu, J. (2013). *Intellectual capital performance in the higher education sector: A study of top Indian institutions*. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 14(2), 264–282.
- Kianto, A., Andreeva, T., & Pavlov, Y. (2014). *The impact of intellectual capital management on company competitiveness and financial performance*. Knowledge Management Research & Practice, 12(3), 305–314.
- Kong, E., & Prior, D. (2008). *An intellectual capital perspective of nonprofit strategy*. International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 13(3), 219–228.
- Kumar, A., & Dash, M. (2019). *Sustainability in Management Education: A Study of Top Indian B-Schools*. International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 20(6), 1022–1042.

- Leitner, K. H. (2004). *Intellectual capital reporting for universities: conceptual background and application for Austrian universities*. Research Evaluation, 13(2), 129–140.
- Rama krishnan, K. (2020). *Intellectual Capital in Higher Education Institutions: A Study of Indian Business Schools*. Asian Journal of Business Ethics, 9, 15–33.
- Ramirez, Y., & Gordillo, S. (2014). *Recognition of intellectual capital in Spanish universities*. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 15(1), 173–188.
- Renzl, B., et al. (2006). *The impact of trust on knowledge sharing*. Journal of Knowledge Management, 10(1), 145–156.
- Sengupta, J., & Sinha, A. (2005). *Indian higher education: Structure, growth and challenges*. Journal of Educational Planning and Administration, 19(2), 187–202.
- Sharma, A., & Sharma, D. (2016). *Exploring the role of intellectual capital in enhancing performance of Indian management institutions*. International Journal of Learning and Change, 8(1), 34–51.
- Sharma, M., & Sharma, R. K. (2010). *Intellectual capital measurement in universities*. Journal of Business Management, 3(2), 30–38.
- Stewart, T. A. (1997). *Intellectual Capital: The New Wealth of Organizations*. Doubleday.
- Warden, C. A. (2003). *Managing and measuring intellectual capital in institutions of higher learning*. In Singapore Management Review, 25(2), 1–28.
- Youndt, M. A., et al. (2004). *Intellectual capital profiles: An examination of investments and returns*. Journal of Management Studies, 41(2), 335–361.
- Abeysekera, I. (2007). *Intellectual capital reporting between a developing and developed nation*. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 8(2), 329–345.
- Abeysekera, I., & Guthrie, J. (2004). *Human capital reporting in a developing nation*. British Accounting Review, 36(3), 251–268.
- Abhayawansa, S. A. (2013). *A review of guidelines and frameworks on external reporting of intellectual capital*.
- Aitouche, S., Zermane, H., Titah, M., Zerari, N., Latreche, K., & Kaanit, A. (2018). *Relative bibliometrics of intellectual capital and knowledge management in SCOPUS*. 2018(JUL), 3166–3175.
- Amadi, L. (2017). *Intellectual capital and environmental sustainability measurement nexus : a review of the literature Imoh Imoh-Ita*. 14(2), 154–176.
- Arab-Rahmatipour, M., Foroutan-Rad, L., Mirhosseini, Z., Arab-Rahmatipour, M. J., & Aghaei, O. (2018). *Investigating the relationship between optimal use of knowledge and intellectual capital management among library managers of public hospitals*. International Journal of Information Science and Management, 16(1), 121–

135. www.scopus.com

- Authors, F. (2006). *Intellectual capital Measurement effectiveness*.
- Authors, F. (2012). *The performance of intellectual capital Mobilising relationships between intellectual*.
- Authors, F. (2014). *Creating value from intellectual assets*.
- Authors, F. (2015). *Collaborative Capital: Creating Intangible Value Article information :*
- Ayache, Z., & Adjali, D. (2015). The role of intellectual capital management in enhancing organization' competitiveness: An empirical study on algerian insurance organizations. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 311–324.
- Baima, G., Forliano, C., Santoro, G., & Vrontis, D. (2020). Intellectual capital and business model: a systematic literature review to explore their linkages. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 22(3), 653–679.
- Baima, G., Santoro, G., & Vrontis, D. (2020). *Intellectual capital and business model : a systematic literature review to explore their linkages*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-02-2020-0055>
- Bontis, N., & Serenko, A. (2007). The moderating role of human capital management practices on employee capabilities. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 11(3), 31–51.
- Burlov, V. (2020). *The law of maintaining the integrity of an object is a methodological basis for solving problems intellectual capital management*. 2020-October, 100–108.
- Burlov, V., & Novikova, A. (2022). *Mathematical Model of Intellectual Capital Management as the Basis for the Development of a Transport Company: Vol. 403 LNNS* (pp. 1551–1559). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH.
- Castro, G. M., Díez-vial, I., & Delgado-verde, M. (2019). *Intellectual capital and the firm : evolution and research trends*. 20(4), 555–580.
- Cheng, E. C. K. (2022b). The Rise of School Intellectual Capital Management. In *Managing School Intellectual Capital for Strategic Development: Lessons from Asia and Europe* (pp. 3–18). Taylor and Francis.
- Cheng, M. Y., Lin, J. Y., Hsiao, T. Y., & Lin, T. W. (2010). Invested resource, competitive intellectual capital, and corporate performance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 11(4), 433–450.
- Cleary, P. (2015). An empirical investigation of the impact of management accounting on structural capital and business performance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 16(3), 566–586.

- Córcoles, Y. R. (2013). Empirical Evidence for the Increasing Importance of Intellectual Capital Reporting in Higher Education Institutions. In *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* (Vol. 3, Issue 8). www.ijhssnet.com
- Costa, R., & Santos, A. (2016). Designing and testing an intellectual capital management model in practice. In G. B., M. S., & G. B. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the European Conference on Knowledge Management, ECKM* (Vols. 2016-January, pp. 198–208). Academic Conferences Limited.
- Costa, R. V, Fernández-jardon, C., & Dorrego, F. (2014). *Critical elements for product innovation at Portuguese innovative SMEs : an intellectual capital perspective*. April, 322–338.
- De Matos Pedro, E., Leitão, J., & Alves, H. (2020). Bridging intellectual capital, sustainable development and quality of life in higher education institutions. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(2).
- Diaz-delgado, M. F., Gil, H., Oltra-badenes, R., & Martinez-ardila, H. E. (2019). *Detonating factors of collaborative innovation from the human capital management*. 14(1), 145–160.
- Dumay, J. (2011). Intellectual capital and strategy development: An interventionist approach. *VINE*, 41(4), 449–465.
- Dumay, J. (2014). *A review and critique of content analysis as a methodology for inquiring into IC disclosure*.
- Dumay, J. C., & Dumay, J. C. (2013). *Grand theories as barriers to using IC concepts*.
- Elena G. (2015). Transformation And Concentration Of Intellectual Capital As A Factor Of Economic Growth In The Modern Economy Popkova. In *Regional and Sectoral Economic Studies* (Vol. 15, Issue 1).
- Elena-Pérez, S., Saritas, O., Pook, K., & Warden, C. (2011). Ready for the future? Universities' capabilities to strategically manage their intellectual capital. *Foresight*, 13(2), 31–48.
- Enrique, L., & Soler, V. (2014). *Evaluating the scope of IC in firms ' value*.
- Evans, J. M., Brown, A., & Baker, G. R. (2015). Intellectual capital in the healthcare sector: a systematic review and critique of the literature. *BMC Health Services Research*, 1–14.
- Faraji, O., Asiaei, K., Rezaee, Z., Bontis, N., & Dolatzarei, E. (2022). Mapping the conceptual structure of intellectual capital research: A co-word analysis. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, 7(3).
- Fedorova, A., & Ponomareva, O. (2017). *Developing university hr potential as the basis for its intellectual capital* (L. I.T., S. R., & S. R. (Eds.); Vols. 2017-April, pp. 97–105). Academic Conferences Limited.

- Galeitzke, M., Steinhöfel, E., Orth, R., & Kohl, H. (2015). Strategic intellectual capital management as a driver of organisational innovation Strategic intellectual capital management. In *Int. J. Knowledge and Learning* (Vol. 10, Issue 2).
- Garcia-Perez, A., Sallos, M. P., & Tiwasing, P. (2021). Dimensions of cybersecurity performance and crisis response in critical infrastructure organisations: an intellectual capital perspective. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*.
- Gross-Gołacka, E., Kusterka-Jefmańska, M., Spalek, P., & Jefmański, B. (2021). Perception of intellectual capital and its impact on business sustainability: Evidence from small, medium, and large enterprises. *E a M: Ekonomie a Management*, 24(2), 35–50.
- Habib, M., Abbas, J., & Noman, R. (2019). Are human capital, intellectual property rights, and research and development expenditures really important for total factor productivity? An empirical analysis. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 46(6), 756–774.
- Ha, C. T., Thao, T. T. P., Trung, N. T., Huong, L. T. T., Dinh, N. V., & Trung, T. (2020). A Bibliometric Review of Research on STEM Education in ASEAN: Science Mapping the Literature in Scopus Database, 2000 to 2019. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 16(10).
- Halid, S., Choo, H. C., & Salleh, K. (2015). *Intellectual capital management and sustainable competitive advantage: A proposed model for Malaysian PLCs* (R. V. & W. L. (Eds.); Vols. 2015-January, pp. 355–362). Academic Conferences and Publishing International Limited.
- Hoang, H. T., Nguyen, H. T. H., Vu, N. H., Le, A. H., & Quach, H. H. (2020). Intellectual capital and firm performance in Vietnam 2012–2016. *International Journal of Learning and Intellectual Capital*, 17(1), 27–46.
- Housel, T. J., Nelson, S. K., & Nelson, S. K. (2009). *Knowledge valuation analysis Applications for organizational intellectual*.
- Huang, H., Leone, D., Caporuscio, A., & Kraus, S. (2021). Managing intellectual capital in healthcare organizations. A conceptual proposal to promote innovation. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 22(2), 290–310.
- Iacuzzi, S., Massaro, M., & Garlatti, A. (2020). Value creation through collective intelligence: Managing intellectual capital. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 18(1), 68–79.
- Iivonen, M., & Huotari, M. (2015). *Advances in Library Administration and Organization Article information :*
- Illanes, M. H., & Viedma Martí, J. M. (2018). *In search of a framework for personal healthcare management in oncology*. 2, 1012–1020. www.scopus.com

- Isaac, R. G., Herremans, I. M., & Kline, T. J. B. (2009). Intellectual capital management: Pathways to wealth creation. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 10(1), 81–92.
- Kasztler, A., & Leitner, K.-H. (2002). Bibliometric analysis and visualisation of intellectual capital. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, 8(5), 516–525.
- Kohnová, L., & Papula, J. (2020). *WHO drives innovation activities? Evidence from innovative European countries*. 227–236.
- Kok, A. (2007). Intellectual Capital Management as Part of Knowledge Management Initiatives at Institutions of Higher Learning. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5, 181–192. www.ejkm.com
- Kok, J. A. (n.d.). *Intellectual capital management at universities*.
- Kong, E. (2007). *The strategic importance of intellectual capital in the non-profit sector*. 8(4), 721–731.
- Korableva, O. N., Gorelov, N., & Kalimullina, O. (2020). *Contemporary Issues of Intellectual Capital: Bibliographic Analysis* (pp. 457–464). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH.
- Kostenko, O., Kravchenko, O., Ovcharova, N., Oleksich, Z., & Dmytrenko, A. (2021). Integrated reporting in investment decision-making process: Bibliometric analysis of scientific landscape. *Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 7(2), 141–159.
- Kramin, T. V., Fatkhiev, A. M., Timiryasova, A. V., & Kochetkova, N. V. (2015). Model of intellectual capital management at universities, based on transactional approach. *Asian Social Science*, 11(11), 148–154.
- Labra, R., & Sa, M. P. (2011). *National intellectual capital assessment models : a literature review*.
- Lacuzzi, S., Massaro, M., & Garlatti, A. (2019). *Intellectual capital and value creation beyond service delivery: A case study*. 2019-May, 135–143. www.scopus.com
- Lee, S. H. (2010). Using fuzzy AHP to develop intellectual capital evaluation model for assessing their performance contribution in a university. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37(7), 4941–4947.
- Lentjušenkova, O., & Lapina, I. (2020). An integrated process-based approach to intellectual capital management. *Business Process Management Journal*, 26(7), 1833–1850.
- Levina, E. Y., Bodina, E. A., Artemova, E. G., Kiryakova, A. V., Matvievskaia, E. G., Kriskovets, T. N., Ogorodnikova, V. V., & Kashina, S. G. (2019). University intellectual capital formation and development. *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(4), 1100–1107.
- Lin, W. (2011). *Does ownership structure affect firm value ? Intellectual capital across industries perspective*.

- Malik, S. Y., Cao, Y., Mughal, Y. H., Kundi, G. M., Mughal, M. H., & Ramayah, T. (2020). Pathways towards sustainability in organizations: Empirical evidence on the role of green human resource management practices and green intellectual capital. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(8).
- Management in electroplating (Part 7): Knowledge management (intellectual capital management) . (2016). *Galvanotechnik*, 107(9), 1826–1832.
- Manes-Rossi, F., Bisogno, M., Aversano, N., & Citro, F. (2020). Intellectual capital in Italian healthcare: senior managers' perspectives. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 33(6–7), 629–646.
- Marr, B., Schiuma, G., & Neely, A. (2004). *Intellectual capital – defining key performance indicators for organizational knowledge assets*. 10(5), 551–569.
- Marzo, G., & Scarpino, E. (2016). Exploring intellectual capital management in SMEs: an in-depth Italian case study. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 17(1), 27–51.
- Massingham, P., Nguyet, T., & Nguyen, Q. (2011). *Using 360 degree peer review to validate self-reporting in human capital measurement*. 12(1), 43–74.
- Matos, F., Vairinhos, V., & Osinski, M. (2017). *Intellectual capital management as an indicator of sustainability* (B.-M. J., M.-M. M., B. R., B. R., M. F., & B.-M. J. (Eds.); Vol. 2, pp. 655–663). Academic Conferences Limited.
- Mehralian, G., Akhavan, P., & Rasekh, H. R. (2013). *A framework for human capital indicators in knowledge-based industries : evidence from pharmaceutical industry*.
- Mikhaylov, A., Kuznetsova, T. Y., & Peker, I. Y. (2019). *Knowledge geography: Human geography approach to measuring regional divergence of knowledge capital* (T. E., C. F., & S. R.R. (Eds.); Vol. 2, pp. 738–745). Academic Conferences Limited.
- Minică, M. (2020). Knowledge and intellectual capital management in higher education. In *Studies in Systems, Decision and Control* (Vol. 247, pp. 67–78). Springer.
- Mondal, A., Mukherjee, S., & Basak, R. (2022). Are Islamic banks intellectually efficient? Empirical evidence from Bangladesh. *International Journal of Learning and Intellectual Capital*, 19(3), 236–256.
- Navas-lo, E., Martí, G., & Alama-salazar, E. (2001). *Organizational capital as competitive advantage of the firm*.
- Nickerson, J. A., & Silverman, B. S. (1997). Intellectual Capital Management Strategy: The Foundation of Successful New Business Generation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 1(4), 320–331.
- Nikolaj Bukh, P., & Johanson, U. (2003). Research and knowledge interaction: Guidelines for intellectual capital reporting. In *Journal of Intellectual Capital* (Vol. 4, Issue 4, pp. 576–587).
- Nikolaichuk, O., Arkhyenko, S., & Matukova-Yaryha, D. (2019). Intellectual capital

management as a composite value of corporate enterprise in a global economy. *Espacios*, 40(16).

- O, K. J., Schulte Jr Harry F Byrd Jr, W. D., & Schulte Jr, W. (2007). Models for human capital management: human resource management of intellectual capital. In *Int. J. Learning and Intellectual Capital* (Vol. 4, Issue 4).
- Omotayo, F. O., & Omiunu, O. G. (2019). Intellectual capital management and organisational performance of small and medium enterprises in Oyo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Learning and Intellectual Capital*, 16(4), 336–358.
- Ordo, P. (2003). *Intellectual capital reporting in Spain : a comparative view*. 4(1), 61–81.
- Ozdemir, N. (2017). *Intellectual capital management in the context of internationalization* (L. I.T.,
- Pedrini, M. P. (2007). Human capital convergences in intellectual capital and sustainability reports. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 8(2), 346–366.
- Pedro, E., Leitão, J., Alves, H., & Pedro, E. (2018). *Back to the future of intellectual capital research : a systematic literature review*.
- Pinto, A. S., Costa, E., & Alves, P. (2020). *Shared service centers as a tool for intellectual capital management*. 2, 145–153.
- Piontkewicz, R., Freitas, M. D. C. D., Kemczinski, A., & Martin, C. D. S. (2016). *Management of intellectual capital in a system of management accounting information* (D. I., F. F.G., & M. M.-J. (Eds.); pp. 180–187). Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc.
- Pirogova, O., & Plotnikov, V. (2020). *Intellectual capital management within the framework of the VBM concept*. 157.
- Ponomarenko, T. V, & Khaertdinova, D. Z. (2015). Corporate systems of the knowledge management in the practices of integrated companies. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3S3), 203–212.
- Roze, N. S. (2021). Measurement of the intellectual capital of russian regions. *R-Economy*, 7(2), 72–87.
- Sánchez, M. P., Elena, S., & Castrillo, R. (2009). Intellectual capital dynamics in universities: A reporting model. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 10(2), 307–324.
- Salas, D. A., Criollo, P., & Ramirez, A. D. (2021). The role of higher education institutions in the implementation of circular economy in Latin America. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(17).
- Salazar-Elena, J. C., Cancino, C. A., López López, A., & Guimón de Ros, J. (2020). *Intellectual capital management and the innovation process: Does one size fit all?* (Vol. 894, pp. 1–12). Springer Verlag.
- Sallos, M. P., Garcia-Perez, A., Bedford, D., & Orlando, B. (2019). Strategy and

organisational cybersecurity: a knowledge-problem perspective. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 20(4), 581–597.

- Samaibekova, Z., Zaid, S. S. M., Molchanova, A., & Rybakova, A. (2019). Managing the intellectual potential in the higher education system. *Terra Economicus*, 17(4), 174–189.
- Santis, F. De, & Giuliani, M. (2013). *A look on the other side : investigating intellectual liabilities*.
- Secundo, G., Massaro, M., Dumay, J., & Bagnoli, C. (2018). Intellectual capital management in the fourth stage of IC research: A critical case study in university settings. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 19(1), 157–177.
- Secundo, G., Passiante, G., Matos, F., & do Rosário Cabrita, M. (2015). *Intellectual capital in academic entrepreneurship: Moving beyond measurement* (M. M. & G. A. (Eds.); Vol. 0, pp. 684–691). Academic Conferences and Publishing International Limited.
- Shchepkina, N., Meshkova, N., Goigova, M., Maisigova, L., & Tochieva, L. (2022). *Intellectual capital as a factor in ensuring the competitiveness of the railway transport enterprises*. 63, 1444–1453.
- Silva, R., Leal, C., Marques, C. S., & Ferreira, J. (2017). *The strategic knowledge management, innovation and competitiveness: a bibliometric analysis* (L. I.T., S. R., & S. R. (Eds.); Vols. 2017–April, pp. 303–311). Academic Conferences Limited.
- 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.
- Stauf, C., & Horeth, M. (2020). Benefits and effects of intellectual property rights. *International Journal of Intellectual Property Management*, 10(2), 99–112.
- Svistunov, O., Polozhentseva, K., Panchenko, A., Stadnyk, M., & Li, M. (2019). Strategic management of intellectual capital of the enterprise in the framework of informatization of the economy. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 18(Special Issue 1), 1–9. www.scopus.com
- Tamošiūnienė, R., & Survilaitė, S. (2016). Assessment of intellectual capital in joint-stock companies. *Business: Theory and Practice*, 17(1), 56–64.
- Tan, H. P., Plowman, D., & Hancock, P. (2008). *The evolving research on intellectual capital*. 9(4), 585–608.
- Ustinova, O. E. (2019). *Evolutional approaches to evaluating of effectiveness of intellectual capital management of economic entity*. 1565–1573. www.scopus.com
- Van Hoa, T. T., Huong, L. T. L., Linh, D. H., & Mai, N. P. (2018). Relational capital and intellectual capital management at enterprises in transitional countries: The case of Vietnam. *Economic Annals-XXI*, 172(7–8), 51–56.

- Veltri, S., & Mastroleo, G. (2012). *Measuring intellectual capital in the university sector using a fuzzy logic expert system*. July, 1–18.
- Wang, P. (2022). A study on the intellectual capital management over cloud computing using analytic hierarchy process and partial least squares. *Kybernetes*, 51(6), 2089–2108.
- Westnes, P. (2003). *Evaluating intellectual capital in the hotel industry*. 4(3), 287–303.
- Wiig, K. M. (n.d.). *Integrating Intellectual Capital and Knowledge Management*.
- Wu, A. (2005). *The integration between Balanced Scorecard and intellectual capital*. 6(2), 267–284.