European Accounting Review ›

Volume 12, 2003 - Issue 4: Intangibles and Intellectual Capital

3,102 Views | 35 CrossRef citations to date | 3 Altmetric

Original Articles

Accounting for intangible assets: current requirements, key players and future directions

Stephen Powell

Pages 797-811 | Published online: 17 May 2010

Cite this article https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180310001628473

Sample our Economics, Finance, Business & Industry Journals >> Sign in here to start your access to the latest two volumes for 14 days

Full Article | Figures & data | References | Citations | Metrics

Reprints & Permissions | Read this article | Share

Abstract

This article provides an international (cross-country) review of current accounting requirements for intangible assets, identifies the key trend setters and considers potential future directions in the area of accounting for intangible assets. Accounting for intangible assets is one of the least developed areas of accounting theory and regulation. This article makes up part of the special forum devoted to furthering debate on accounting for intangible assets.

Previous article | View issue table of contents | Next article

Notes

[1]The views expressed in this article are solely those of the author. The author wishes to thank Dr Anne Wyatt from the University of Melbourne for reviewing an earlier draft of this paper.

[2]Lev (2001) provides a summary of this evidence.

[3]Consistent with this, Lev and Zarowin (1999) provide evidence not only of a decline in the usefulness of financial accounting information during the period 1978 to 1996 but also that this decline is most pronounced in enterprises that have increased expenditure on intangible assets (as measured by enterprise expenditure on research and development).

[4]A comprehensive review of the accounting requirements for intangible assets in a range of countries can be found in Stolowy and Jeny-Cazavan (2001).

[5]Throughout this article, the term 'jurisdictions' should be taken to refer to the eight national jurisdictions and also the IASB.

[6]In the UK, FRS 6 'Acquisitions and Mergers' (ASB, 1994) sets out a series of conditions that must be satisfied for the transaction to be a merger. The IASB sets out similar conditions for a transaction to be considered a uniting of interests.

[7]In France, only applied research costs can be capitalized; basic research costs must be expensed.

[8]The position in Australia is slightly different to that of EU countries. In Australia, an adopted IAS/IFRS may be applicable to all reporting entities, not just listed companies. However, additional guidance/requirements may be added for not-for-profit entities where it is considered appropriate. Any additional guidance/requirements would not be applicable to for-profit entities (AASB, 2003).

[9]The position in New Zealand with respect to the scope of application of any adopted IAS/IFRS is similar to that of Australia. The New Zealand Financial Reporting Standards Board has established a Conversion Working Group to consider whether any additional requirements and guidance are required to ensure that IASB standards adopted in New Zealand can be applied to all entities, including public-sector entities (FRSB, 2003).

[10]National accounting requirements will still be needed in circumstances not covered by an IAS/IFRS; for example, to cover an issue that is jurisdiction specific.

[11]Haller (2002) provides a history of financial accounting developments in the EU, including the impact of 2005.

[12]National accounting requirements will still be needed in circumstances not covered by an IAS/IFRS; for example, to cover an issue that is jurisdiction specific.

[13]See Lev (2001), Upton (2001) and Wyatt (2002a) for a further discussion on the economic properties of intangible assets.

[14]See Aboody and Lev (1998), Abrahams and Sidhu (1998) and Healy et al. (2002).

[15]Under the Lev and Zarowin approach, reinstatement would occur once the project's feasibility has been established.

[16]Concerns regarding the degree of judgement required to apply the condition-based capitalization approach was stated by the FASB as one of the reasons why it was not adopted in the US (FASB, 1974).

Related Research Data

The Role of R&D Capitalisations in Firm Valuation and Perfor Mance Measurement
Source: Australian Journal of Management
International accounting disharmony: the case of intangibles
Source: Accounting Auditing & Accountability Journal
Towards a financial reporting framework for intangibles
Source: Journal of Intellectual Capital
Revalued Financial, Tangible, and Intangible Assets: Associations with Share Prices and Non-Market-Based Value Estimates
Source: Journal of Accounting Research
R&D Accounting and the Tradeoff Between Relevance and Objectivity
Source: Journal of Accounting Research
Capital Markets Research And The Goodwill Debate
Source: Australian Accounting Review
Goodwill Amortization and the Usefulness of Earnings
Source: SSRN Electronic Journal

Related research

People also read | Recommended articles | Cited by 35

Accounting for intangible assets: suggested solutions >

Richard Barker et al.
Accounting and Business Research
Published online: 7 Sep 2021

Information for

Authors
R&D professionals
Editors
Librarians
Societies

Open access

Overview
Open journals
Open Select
Dove Medical Press
F1000Research

Opportunities

Reprints and e-prints
Advertising solutions
Accelerated publication
Corporate access solutions

Help and information

Help and contact
Newsroom
All journals
Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

Sign me up

Copyright © 2026 Informa UK Limited Privacy policy

Cookies Terms & conditions Accessibility

Registered in England & Wales No. 01072954
5 Howick Place | London | SW1P 1WG