HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

THE ASSETIZATION OF TALENT: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS, QUANTITATIVE VALUATION MODELS, AND AUDITING PROTOCOLS FOR HUMAN RESOURCE ACCOUNTING (HRA)

Nematullayev Hamidullo
Andijan State Technical Institute
3rd year student of the "Accounting and Audit" direction
E-mail: hamidullonematullaev.07@gmail.com
0009-0001-4040-8014
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21331426

Abstract: In the high-velocity knowledge economy, the primary constraint on corporate scale and enterprise value is no longer physical equipment or financial access, but the specialized capability and cognitive efficiency of corporate workforce networks. This article evaluates the operational frameworks of Human Resource Accounting (HRA) within international financial reporting guidelines and non-financial capital disclosure metrics. By analyzing advanced corporate evaluation models—including Flamholtz's Stochastic Rewards Model, the Historical Acquisition Cost Approach, and the Lev and Schwartz Economic Value Model—this study establishes a structured diagnostic verification framework for external auditors and corporate controllers. Integrating rigorous mathematical evaluation methods with advanced risk impairment tracking procedures provides corporate oversight authorities with a clear methodology for identifying talent metrics, preventing greenwashing of human capital claims, and verifying balance sheet transparency.

Key words: Human Resource Accounting (HRA), Flamholtz's Stochastic Rewards Model, mathematical evaluation methods, Schwartz Economic Value Model.

Introduction. The evolution of modern industrial commerce has transformed the fundamental drivers of economic production. Historically, accounting frameworks were structured to prioritize physical assets like machinery and raw materials, treating labor costs simply as short-term expenses. However, the emergence of software engineering, biotech pipelines, and sophisticated technical services has flipped corporate cost structures, shifting the true value center of a firm directly to its human capital. Human Resource Accounting (HRA) acts as the analytical accounting discipline that identifies, measures, and reports data regarding human resources within an organization. Concurrently, Auditing Human Capital serves as the independent verification process designed to evaluate the validity, capitalization limits, and economic impairment parameters of workforce expenditures. Without quantitative verification models, corporate workforce tracking remains purely descriptive, preventing real internalization of talent value into strategic investment decisions. Integrating human capabilities into mainstream corporate balance sheets presents major structural challenges for traditional regulatory frameworks. Under current International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS)—specifically IAS 38—internally generated human capital is generally banned from formal balance sheet recognition due to a lack of complete legal ownership. Because employees retain the freedom to resign, a firm cannot enforce the absolute legal 'control' required to declare workforce networks as permanent corporate assets.

Despite these formal balance sheet limits, modern reporting frameworks require extensive disclosures regarding human capital. The International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) through general metrics and the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI 404) demand explicit disclosures on human

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

asset indicators, including structural retention metrics, training return profiles, and gender compensation statistics. These overlapping tracking mandates force modern corporate auditors to verify the statistical integrity of employee data alongside traditional financial statements. Evaluating an organization's human asset layer requires robust, repeatable quantitative methods that translate workforce metrics into financial values. The historical cost model focuses entirely on tracking actual outlays, accumulating all expenses related to recruitment, onboarding, and training, and then amortizing those costs over the expected employee tenure.

To capture future value generation, economic valuation models offer sophisticated alternatives. The Lev and Schwartz model calculates the present value of an employee's future earnings up to retirement, applying a targeted corporate discount rate. Flamholtz's Stochastic Rewards Model adds operational nuance by factoring in movement probabilities, calculating the statistical likelihood of an individual moving through distinct corporate roles, promotions, or unexpected departures over time. To assist financial controllers in selecting the appropriate framework, Table 1 delineates the technical execution parameters, primary target areas, and unique auditing vulnerabilities across core HRA valuation models.

Technical execution parameters, primary target areas, and unique auditing vulnerabilities across core HRA valuation models

Table 1.

HRA Model	Technical Execution Parameters	Primary Balance Sheet/Disclosure Target	Core Forensic Audit Risk & Vulnerability
Historical Cost Model	Capitalizes all actual outlays for recruitment and onboarding; amortizes costs over estimated service lifespans.	Amortized recruitment assets, localized labor cost tracking.	Fails to reflect the real economic productivity or current market value of the employee.
Lev & Schwartz Model	Calculates the present value of future earnings up to retirement using a standard corporate discount rate.	Long-term human asset estimation, future compensation obligations.	Highly sensitive to salary growth rate assumptions; ignores internal employee promotions.
Flamholtz Stochastic Model	Combines expected service values with a probability matrix tracking internal promotion and attrition paths.	Strategic talent reserves, high-level operational value disclosure.	Extremely complex tracking parameters; requires large historical datasets to build reliable probability matrices.

Deep Analysis of Table 1: The metrics presented in Table 1 reveal that choosing the right model requires balancing simple tracking against operational detail. The Historical Cost approach is highly objective and easy to verify through standard payroll invoices, but it cannot measure an employee's actual productivity or contribution to profit. Conversely, economic models like the Lev & Schwartz or Flamholtz frameworks capture future value, but they depend heavily on assumptions regarding promotion paths and discount rates. A tiny shift in the discount rate or an unexpected change in

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

attrition trends can cause major valuation errors. Consequently, human capital auditors must run deep sensitivity stress tests on these variables to maintain financial reporting transparency. Traditional corporate audits verify physical assets by tracking asset location tags and invoices. A comprehensive human capital audit, however, requires combining payroll records, employment contracts, and operational tracking data. Auditors must check data across multiple internal systems to ensure metrics are realistic.

Verification protocols require reconciling HR database headcounts directly with payroll tax filings to prevent phantom employees, reviewing employment contracts to confirm corporate ownership of staff intellectual output, and tracking voluntary attrition metrics across distinct divisions. Furthermore, if a firm capitalizes training outlays as deferred assets, auditors must verify that the programs directly increase productivity rather than simply covering basic regulatory updates. Workforce volatility can cause rapid adjustments to operational capacity and disclosure accuracy. Table 2 outlines the primary risk fields, warning signs, and verification protocols for these human asset exposures.

Primary risk fields, warning signs, and verification protocols for these human asset exposures.

Table 2.

Human Asset Risk Area	Primary Drivers of Financial Volatility	Key Risk Indicators (Red Flags)	Mandatory Audit Verification Protocol
Mass Talent Attrition & Brain Drain	Competitor hiring campaigns, corporate culture decay, or shifting compensation trends.	Sudden rise in turnover among senior technical staff; drop in Glassdoor sentiment scores.	Reviewing exit interview data; cross-checking internal retention statistics with regional industry standards.
Impairment of Training Assets	Rapid technological shifts making recent training programs obsolete.	Low employee adoption of new software systems; drop in productivity metrics.	Testing post-training performance data; confirming capitalized training outlays still offer economic utility.
Labor Regulatory Non-Compliance	Changes in regional minimum wage laws or employee misclassification rules.	Surge in employment lawsuits; union disputes or formal government investigations.	Reviewing legal correspondence; running sample checks on contractor classifications against local labor laws.

Deep Analysis of Table 2: The risk mapping in Table 2 highlights that human asset values depend heavily on workforce stability and compliance. If key developers or engineers leave an organization rapidly, the capitalized investment in their onboarding and specialized training is lost immediately, requiring an instant asset write-down under IAS 36. This risk means human capital auditors cannot treat talent disclosures as stable compliance notes. They must actively monitor operational data like turnover trends, software adoption metrics, and labor legal structures to ensure financial reporting accurately reflects corporate stability. As corporate performance becomes more dependent on talent metrics, traditional annual HR surveys are no longer sufficient to process complex

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

workforce data. Maintaining transparency requires a shift away from static descriptions and toward continuous, data-driven tracking architectures.

Integrating organizational network analysis (ONA) with enterprise systems allows management to monitor real-time collaboration and productivity metrics without relying on subjective manager reviews. Furthermore, managing training credentials and performance histories on decentralized networks gives auditors verified data that simplifies retention tracking and ensures human capital disclosures are realistic and transparent.

Conclusion. In conclusion, this research paper demonstrates that structured human resource accounting and auditing frameworks are essential for maintaining reporting integrity in modern economies. By applying disciplined quantitative models like the historical cost, Lev & Schwartz, and Flamholtz frameworks, and matching them with independent physical and operational verification protocols, companies can manage long-term talent risks and protect financial transparency. As international disclosure rules expand, adopting automated tracking tools will ensure corporate accounting frameworks remain realistic, resilient, and responsive to the real value of human capital.

References:

1. Flamholtz, E. G. (1999). Human Resource Accounting: Advances in Concepts, Methods and Applications (3rd ed.). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
2. Lev, B., & Schwartz, A. (1971). On the Use of the Economic Concept of Human Capital in Financial Statements. The Accounting Review, 46(1), 103-112.
3. International Accounting Standards Board (IASB). (2004). International Accounting Standard 38: Intangible Assets. IFRS Foundation.
4. Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). (2016). GRI 404: Training and Education Standard. GRI Publishing.
5. Mayo, A. (2021). The Human Value of the Enterprise: Valuing People as Assets - Monitoring, Measuring, Managing. Nicholas Brealey Publishing.