

IJSSB1

by Saarce Ivana

Submission date: 05-Nov-2021 03:15PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1693740270

File name: ivana_turnitin_check.docx (55.59K)

Word count: 5308

Character count: 30806

Intellectual Capital Disclosures Analysis of Indonesia and Thailand Tourism and Hospitality Industry: Comparison of Ownership Structure

Abstract

Each company had a different ownership structure that can affect the company's disclosures. This study aimed to examine the differences in the level of ICD and its components in Thailand and Indonesia, which have several similarities. The ownership structure is divided into two types, namely managerial ownership and financial institution ownership. This study used a non-parametric statistical test in the Mann-Whitney Test by first conducting a normality test. The results indicated no significant difference in the ICD level between companies that have and companies that do not have managerial ownership. This study also did not find any significant difference in the ICD level for the companies with and without financial institution ownership. In addition, this study found a significant difference in the level of ICD between companies that have and companies that do not have financial institution ownership.

Keywords:

Managerial Ownership, Financial Institution Ownership, Intellectual Capital Disclosure

1. Introduction

Each company has a different ownership structure, depending on the country or economic sector in which the company is located (Elvin & Hamid, 2016). Differences in ownership structure can also rely on the business combinations carried out by the company (Procházková, 2017). This ownership structure can contribute to competitiveness or reduce information asymmetry problems within the company (Elvin & Hamid, 2016; Raimo et al., 2020). It allows companies that have different ownership structures have a distinct competitive advantage. In addition, the company's ownership structure dramatically influences the disclosure policy, where the procedure can increase the level and quality of the company's disclosure (Raimo et al., 2020).

Based on the agency theory, the relationship between management and shareholders can lead to problems or conflicts of interest between the two parties (Naimah & Mukti, 2019) that make an information asymmetry problem occurs. Information asymmetry is a condition where the information held by the company or management more than the information contained by the market or shareholders (Nurunnabi et al., 2011). In stakeholder theory, companies must carry out various strategies to maintain good relations with their stakeholders (Heryana et al., 2020) that are assumed to have a strong position (Widyastuti & Aprilia, 2021). Therefore, disclosure can be a tool for a company to solve this problem.

In signaling theory, disclosure can also help the company to get a positive signal from investors or stakeholders (Nurunnabi et al., 2011; Machmud et al., 2020; Astuti et al., 2020). Information disclosed is information related to non-financial aspects in the company's annual report used by investors to determine the company's sustainability (Susanto et al., 2019). Based on the legitimacy theory, companies tend to disclose more IC to legitimize their status in society (Rahayu et al., 2019) and ensure the company's activities have complied with regulatory compliance in the community (Birindelli et al., 2020).

The development of disclosure made by the company is currently more focused on intangible assets in the form of Intellectual Capital Disclosure (ICD) (Musman et al., 2018; Oppong & Pattanayak, 2019). ICD can reduce the information asymmetry problem, increase the company's share price, and increase transparency and accountability that is beneficial for the company (Kamath, 2017). In addition, Intellectual Capital (IC) can also contribute to achieving competitive advantage and gaining investor confidence regardless of the company's industry (Pasban & Nojedeh, 2016; Widarjo et al., 2019; Astuti et al., 2020). Information related to IC can also increase the company's long-term value, which is needed for sustainability, especially in supporting economic development and people's welfare in line with Sustainable Development Growth (SDGs) (Alvino et al., 2021). Some of these explanations finally make management pay more attention to the ICD by the company.

ICD is disclosed through the company's annual report, which is divided into three items, they are Human Capital (HC), structural capital (SC), and Relational Capital (RC) (Abhayawansa et al., 2016; Wee & Chua, 2016; Yan, 2017; Anifowose et al., 2017; Ozkan et al., 2017; Duff, 2018; Alfraih, 2018; McCracken et al., 2018; Goebel, 2019; Raimo et al., 2020; Mardini & Lahyani, 2020; Mamun & Aktar, 2021; Hatane et al., 2021b). Human Capital (HC) focuses on individual aspects of the company's employees. Structural Capital (SC) refers to the internal structure of the organization. Relational Capital (RC) relates to market or external aspects of the organization. Din et al. (2021) revealed several types of ownership structures, including family ownership, managerial ownership, government ownership, and institutional ownership. This study focuses more on managerial ownership and financial institution ownership.

This study uses a sample of tourism and hospitality industry companies from Thailand and Indonesia as representatives of developing countries. The two countries are known to have established bilateral relations and cooperation in many sectors. It makes both of them have several similarities, especially in terms of tourism and hospitality. Both countries' tourism and hospitality sectors are one of the main drivers of economic growth in those respective countries (Oxford Business Group, 2018; Oxford Business Group, 2019). Thailand and Indonesia are also part of the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), which removes trade barriers and motivates economic growth in Southeast Asian countries (Hatane et al., 2021a). In addition, both countries do not regulate ICD explicitly. They are still being discussed only implicitly where Indonesia uses PSAK No. 19 and Thailand uses TAS No. 51 to describe its intangible assets (Ramananda & Nugrahanti, 2014).

Hersugondo et al. (2021) found that the company ownership structure in the tourism and hospitality industry affects ICD. In addition, several previous studies found that managerial ownership has a significant positive effect on ICD in industries other than tourism and hospitality (Astuti et al., 2020; Mukhibad & Setiawati, 2019; Indarti et al., 2020). The research found a significant negative relationship between managerial ownership and ICD (Alifia & Khafid, 2018; Ulfa et al., 2021). Regarding institutional ownership, previous research found a significant positive effect (Muryanti & Subowo, 2017; Rahayuni et al., 2018) and a significant negative effect (Astuti et al., 2020) between institutional ownership and ICD.

This study starts from the question, "Does the company's ownership structure have a different effect on ICD?". To answer this question, the researcher will conduct a different ICD level test. This research was conducted considering that there are rarely previous studies that have tested the conditions of 2 companies from other countries with similarities in terms of tourism and hospitality.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study used quantitative data obtained from secondary data sources through annual report documents and collect data using documentation techniques from companies in the tourism and hospitality industry in Thailand and Indonesia from 2015 to 2019. The data analysis technique used in this study is a non-parametric statistical test using the Mann-Whitney test and the Jonckheere-Terpstra test through the SPSS application. In addition, this study conducted a previous normality test to determine the research method to be used.

The population used are companies in Thailand and Indonesia listed on the Stock Exchange of Thailand and the Indonesia Stock Exchange with a total population of 57 companies, 33 companies in Indonesia, and 24 companies in Thailand. This study used the purposive sampling method with the criteria that companies have the availability of financial and non-financial data needed in the company's annual report from 2015 to 2019. Of the 57 companies that make up the population, only 51 companies meet the criteria and are selected as samples. Therefore, the research sample used is 51 companies, with 31 from Indonesia and 20 from Thailand.

In this study, researchers calculated the ICD using the average value of HCD, SCD, and RCD. The instrument used to determine this variable has been developed to measure the overall ICD. Therefore, this study uses a disclosure index consisting of 78 items for HCD, 32 items for SCD, and 31 items for RCD. This disclosure index is to measure the extent of ICD in the annual reports of selected sample companies and consider the disclosure items identified from previous studies on the disclosure top of HCD, SCD, and RCD (Abhayawansa et al., 2016; Raimo et al., 2020; Mardini & Lahyani, 2020). HCD refers to the knowledge, experience, motivation, and creativity inherent in an individual. SCD helps build intellectual property through human contributions, including information technology and organizational procedures

and systems, to support employee productivity. RCD represents all resources related to the company's external relations or business relations (Simion & Tobá, 2018). ICD calculation uses a dichotomous approach (unweighted) where "0" is assigned to non-disclosure, and "1" is denoted for items disclosed in HCD, SCD, and RCD.

Managerial ownership is a corporate governance mechanism that can reduce agency conflicts or information asymmetry problems (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Managerial Ownership is the percentage of shares owned by management and measured using the formula for the number of shares owned by the manager divided by the company's total outstanding shares (Putri & Aldhmania, 2018; Mukhibad & Setyawati, 2019). Meanwhile, financial institution ownership is shares owned by financial institutions such as banks, insurance companies and investment companies (Sakawa & Watanabel, 2020). It is measured using the formula for the number of shares owned by financial institutions divided by the company's total outstanding shares. Institutional investors are said to play an essential role in corporate governance and support policies regarding IC (Iranmahd et al., 2014) because they can use that to monitor every decision-making taken by management (Rahayu, 2019).

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Normality Test

Table 1 shows that HCD, SCD, RCD, managerial ownership, and financial institution ownership have normally distributed data. HCD is not normally distributed at a significance level of 10%, SCD is not normally distributed at the 5% significance level, and RCD, managerial ownership, financial institution ownership are not normally distributed at the 1% significance level. Only the ICD shows that the data is normally distributed.

Table 1. Normality Test Result

	HCD	SCD	RCD	ICD	Managerial Ownership	Financial Institution Ownership
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	1.253	1.578	1.745	1.718	6.620	7.218
Asymp. Sig. (p.value 2-tailed)	0.087*	0.014**	0.005***	0.681	0.000***	0.000***

Note: *** 1%, ** 5%, * 10%

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2A shows the results of descriptive statistics for each variable in general. The minimum value of three ICD components explains that, among the three components of the ICD, companies have not paid maximum attention to RCD. Meanwhile, the minimum value of two variables regarding ownership explained that there are companies that do not yet have a managerial or financial institution ownership structure. The maximum value in Table 2A indicates that among the three components of ICD, the company pays the most attention to HCD. The research conducted by Kamarh (2017) can support the results of this study where HC is said to have become a concern and expressed more, especially in Asian countries.

In addition, Table 2A also explains that all ICD components have an even distribution as indicated by their standard deviation values which are smaller than the mean value. The mean value can also support the previous statement which states that companies in Thailand and Indonesia have not paid much attention to RCD. The descriptive statistics regarding the dichotomous variables in this study are as shown in Table 2B. The number of companies in Thailand and Indonesia indicates that the number of companies in Indonesia with managerial ownership is 67% more than companies in Thailand. In contrast, the number of companies in Thailand with financial institution ownership is 88% more than companies in Indonesia.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics*A. Continuous Variable*

	HCD	SCD	RCD	ICD	Managerial Ownership	Financial Institution Ownership
Min	0.10256	0.15625	0.0323	0.2038	0.000	0.000
Max	0.78205	0.75	0.6452	0.6473	65.03	74.3
Mean	0.4830	0.4562	0.2989	0.4127	8.600	14.9934
Standard Deviation	0.1279	0.1323	0.1373	0.1082	14.725	16.7016

B. Dichotomous Variable

Negara	Score 0	Score 1	Total
Managerial Ownership			
Thailand	40 40%	60 60%	100
Indonesia	51 33%	104 67%	155
Total Dichotomous Variable	91 36%	164 64%	255
Financial Institution Ownership			
Thailand	12 12%	88 88%	100
Indonesia	60 39%	95 61%	155
Total Dichotomous Variable	72 28%	183 72%	255

Along with the increase in the year, there was an increase in the number of disclosures made by companies in the tourism and hospitality industry, both in Thailand and Indonesia. As a result, there is an increase in HCD, SCD, and ICD every year for companies in Thailand. Meanwhile, RCD has increased in 2019 and remained constant from 2015 to 2018. This means that this company engaged in Thailand's tourism and hospitality sector has not paid much attention to RCD and began to increase it in 2019.

Table 3 also shows an increase in HCD, SCD, RCD, and ICD every year which indicates that companies engaged in the tourism and hospitality sector in Indonesia have begun to move to focus on all components of the ICD. However, when viewed from the number of disclosures, disclosures related to RC in Indonesia are still not much compared to the disclosures of other aspects such as HC and SC.

Table 3. Disclosure Ordered by Year(s)

	Thailand				
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
HCD	47%	47%	48%	49%	50%
SCD	42%	44%	45%	48%	48%
RCD	29%	29%	29%	29%	31%

	ICD	39%	40%	41%	42%	43%
Indonesia						
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	HCD	45%	48%	49%	51%	53%
	SCD	43%	43%	45%	45%	46%
	RCD	27%	29%	30%	31%	33%
	ICD	38%	40%	41%	42%	44%

Hypotheses Testing

Table 4 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney test regarding differences in the composition of ownership owned by Thailand and Indonesia. Results in Table 4 explain no significant difference between the composition of managerial ownership and financial institution ownership in Thailand and Indonesia.

Table 4. Independent Sample Test Ownership Components based on Country

Country	N	Mean Rank	
		Managerial Ownership	Financial Institution Ownership
Thailand	100	135.31	133.93
Indonesia	155	123.28387	124.1742
Mann-Whitney U	Z	-1.3012	-1.0430
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.19320	0.2969

In addition, this study also conducted the Mann-Whitney test to identify whether there are differences in the ICD components by companies located in Thailand and Indonesia. The results in Table 5 show that there is no significant difference in the disclosures of HC, SC, RC, and IC between Thailand and Indonesia.

Table 5. Independent Sample Test ICD Components based on Country

Country	N	Mean Rank			
		HCD	SCD	RCD	ICD
Thailand	130	129.49	128.545	125.39	126.07
Indonesia	125	127.031	127.6484	129.6839	129.2452
Mann-Whitney U	Z	-0.2593	-0.095	-0.4549	-0.3356
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.7954	0.9243	0.6491	0.7371

Tables 4 and 5 have indicated no significant differences in both the composition of ownership and ICD components of the two countries. Therefore, this study combines the two countries as the research sample. The trend of increasing ICD in both countries is known by conducting the Jonckheere-Terpstra test, Table 6 indicates a significant increasing trend in HCD, SCD, RCD, and ICD every year.

Table 6. ICD Trend

Year	N	Mean Rank			
		HCD	SCD	RCD	ICD
2015	51	111.37	114.29	116.33	111.75
2016	51	119.48	121.50	122.55	120.32
2017	51	127.45	131.46	126.88	128.94
2018	51	136.50	134.44	133.42	135.64
2019	51	145.20	138.30	140.81	143.34
Jonckheere- Terpstra Test	Std. J-T Statistic	2.625	1.912	1.839	2.413
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.009***	0.056*	0.066*	0.016**

Note : *** 1%, ** 5% , * 10%

²³ Table 7 and Table 8 show the results of hypothesis testing. At the time of testing, tourism and hospitality companies located in Thailand and Indonesia were divided into 2, namely companies that have and companies that do not have managerial ownership or financial institution ownership. Table 7 shows that there is no significant difference in the level of HCD, SCD, RCD, and ICD between companies that do not have and companies that have managerial ownership. Table 8 shows an insignificant difference in the level ICD and its components, except for HCD. These results indicate that the HCD for companies with financial institution ownership is significantly greater than companies without financial institution ownership.

Table 7. Independent Sample Test ICD Components based on Managerial Ownership

Managerial Ownership	N	Mean Rank			
		HCD	SCD	RCD	ICD
Not Have	91	124.7473	124.0165	119.2088	121.5989
Have	164	129.8049	130.2104	132.878	131.5518
Mann-Whitney U	Z	-0.5249	-0.6439	-1.4212	-1.0323
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.5996	0.5196	0.1552	0.3019

Table 8. Independent Sample Test ICD Components based on Managerial Ownership

Financial Institution Ownership	N	Mean Rank			
		HCD	SCD	RCD	ICD
Not Have	72	113.757	118.069	123.486	116.368
Have	183	133.603	131.907	129.776	132.576
Mann-Whitney U	Z	-1.9355	-1.3518	-0.6145	-1.5797

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) 0.0529* 0.1765 0.5389 0.1142

Note: *** 1%, ** 5%, * 10%

Table 9 shows the results of the different tests between companies that do not have and companies that have financial institution ownership in Thailand and Indonesia partially. The results in Table 9 show a significant difference between companies that only applies in Thailand. However, companies in Indonesia have not demonstrated significant differences in their HCD.

Table 9. Independent Sample Test ICD Components based on Financial Institution Ownership by Country

<i>Thailand</i>					
Financial Institution Ownership	N	Mean Rank			
		HCD	SCD	RCD	ICD
Not Have	12	32.92	31.67	27.13	25.79
Have	88	52.90	53.07	53.69	53.87
Mann-Whitney U	Z	-2.241	-2.402	-2.987	-3.145
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.025**	0.016**	0.003***	0.002***
<i>Indonesia</i>					
Financial Institution Ownership	N	Mean Rank			
		HCD	SCD	RCD	ICD
Not Have	60	73.84	76.38	81.08	77.23
Have	95	80.63	79.02	76.06	78.48
Mann-Whitney U	Z	-0.917	-0.358	-0.681	-0.169
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.359	0.721	0.496	0.866

Note: *** 1%, ** 5%, * 10%

Analysis

Based on Table 7, it can be concluded that hypothesis from H1: There is a significant difference in the level of ICD between companies that have and companies that do not have managerial ownership is rejected. In addition, Table 7 also shows no significant differences in the level of HCD, RCD, and SCD. The rejection of the first hypothesis and additional research on the three components of the ICD may occur because the companies used as samples have many small managerial ownership compositions. This explanation can be supported by the results of descriptive statistics in Table 2 which shows the average managerial ownership in the company is only 8.6%. However, the same table shows that 64% of companies have managerial ownership. These results indicate that there is a possibility that the manager's role in the company is too small to affect the number of ICDs in the company's annual report. Therefore, the test results state no difference in ICD between the two types of companies used as samples. Several previous studies can support the results of the rejection of the first hypothesis, where managerial ownership has no significant effect on ICD (Rahayuni et al., 2018; Barokah & Fachrurrozie, 2019).

The study results in Table 8 indicate that hypothesis from H2: There is a significant difference in ICD level between companies that have and companies that do not have financial institution ownership in this study

is rejected. The results of this study can be explained through several previous studies, where institutional ownership has no significant effect on ICD (Ahmed Haji & Mohd Ghazali, 2013; Alifia & Khafid, 2018; Indarti et al., 2020; Ulfah et al., 2021). This rejection can also be explained in Table 2, where companies' average financial institution ownership is only 14.9934%. Although the maximum value of ownership is high, reaching up to 74.3% and around 72% of companies have financial institution ownership, the total composition of ownership may be small considering the average is only 14.9934%. These results show that many companies in this study have a small composition of financial institution ownership, so they may not affect the ICD level significantly.

This study conducted additional analysis related to HCD, SCD, and RCD. The analysis found greater HCD from companies with financial institution ownership than companies with no financial institution ownership. The existence of financial institution investors is considered capable of significantly influencing the HCD in companies so that companies can pay more attention to and develop corporate governance. The previous study indicated that institutional ownership positively affected HCD (Mukti & Istianingsih, 2018). Table 2 demonstrates that HCD has the highest average and maximum value compared to other ICD components. It can be proven by research which states that companies that are members of the tourism industry are very dependent on employees' skills and knowledge (Ognjanović, 2017). This result is in line with Signaling Theory, where companies that want to give a positive signal to the market will disclose more. In addition, if seen in Table 3, there is an increase in disclosure regarding HC. It means that companies in both countries pay attention to and continue to strive to improve the knowledge, experience, motivation, and creativity inherent in individuals within the company. This is also following the results of research conducted by Omerzel and Jurdana (2016) which states that customer demand influences innovation made by company employees, especially in the tourism industry. Kamath (2017) also states that HC has received more attention and is disclosed in Asian countries.

The results of this additional study also apply to Thailand. As can be seen in Table 9, there are significant differences in the levels of HCD, SCD, RCD, and ICD between companies that have and companies that do not have financial institution ownership. However, these results are not applied for Indonesia, where the level of ICD and its components do not have a significant difference. It can be explained through Table 2, where the proportion of companies with financial institution ownership in Thailand is greater than in Indonesia. In addition, Liu et al. (2018) state that institutional ownership can increase company transparency. This means that companies in Thailand with larger institutional ownership tend to have a higher level of transparency. However, Table 9 shows that the disclosures made by companies in Indonesia are greater than in Thailand. Therefore, the researcher concludes that there are greater demands from institutional investors regarding transparency in Thailand. Meanwhile, investors in Indonesia have the same needs regarding company transparency.

4. CONCLUSION

This study examines the differences in ICD levels using non-parametric test analysis for 255 annual reports of tourism and hospitality companies in Thailand and Indonesia from 2015 to 2019. This study takes samples from these two countries because of the bilateral relationship between countries, which focuses on developing the tourism industry, the similarities in regulations that have been detailed in regulating the ICD, and the similarities that both developing countries are part of AEC. ICD is examined in detail based on three components, namely HCD, SCD, and RCD. The results of this study indicate an insignificant difference in the level of HCD, SCD, RCD, and ICD between companies that have and companies that do not have managerial ownership. The results also reveal an insignificant difference in the level of SCD, RCD, and ICD between companies that have and companies that do not have financial institution ownership. This study found a significant difference in the level of HCD between companies that have and companies that do not have financial institution ownership. After conducting a partial difference test in financial institution ownership from the two countries, the results show a significant difference in the level of HCD in Thailand.

This study can be beneficial for management since disclosing IC is proven to be favourable for the company's reputation. An optimistic company's reputation can occur when the company has sufficient resources to be uncovered. This study also reveals that excellent human capital expressed in highly innovative employees can be favourable for marketing activities. The marketing activities of tourism and hospitality companies in Indonesia and Thailand have been successfully brought income to the countries

(WorldBank, 2019). Disclosure can reduce information asymmetry **5** investors because transparency can increase legitimacy, so the market has greater trust in the company. **This research contributes to prev** **5** **s studies related to** the ICD level difference test, especially in the tourism and hospitality sector, which **has not been sufficiently highlighted, despite having high IC assets.** This study is limited to a specific industry and does not use data for the 2020 period affected by the Covid-19 pandemic. The next researcher may consider doing a cross-ind **1** **try for comparison, using other company characteristics variables, or using data for the 2020 period to** **enrich the empirical result in the ICD topics.**

5. References

- Abhayawansa, S. & Guthrie, J. (2016). Does Intellectual Capital Disclosure in Analysts Reports Vary by Firm Characteristics?. *Advances in Accounting* 35(C):26-38.
- Ahmed Haji, A. & Mohd Ghazali, N. A. (2013). A Longitudinal Examination of Intellectual Capital Disclosures and Corporate Governance Attributes in Malaysia. *Asian Review of Accounting* 21(1):27-52.
- Alfraih, M. M. (2018). Intellectual Capital Reporting and Its Relation to Market and Financial Performance. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems* 34(3):266-281
- Alifia, D. & Khafid, M. (2018). The Moderation Role of the Audit Committee Quality on the Effect of the Ownership Structure on Intellectual Capital Disclosures. *Jurnal Dinamika Akuntansi* 10(1):27-39.
- Alvino, F., Di Vaio, A., Hassan, R. & Palladino, R. (2021). Intellectual Capital and Sustainable Development: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Intellectual Capital* 22(1):76-94.
- Anifowose, M., Rashid, H. & Annuar, H.A. (2017). Intellectual Capital Disclosure and Corporate Market Value: Does Board Diversity Matter?. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies* 7 (3):369-398.
- Astuti, R. N., Fachrurrozie, F., Amal, M. I., & Zahra, S. F. (2020). Does Audit Committee Quality Mediate Determinants of Intellectual Capital Disclosure?. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business* 7(7):199-208.
- Barokah, L. & Fachrurrozie. (2019). Profitability Mediates the Effect of Managerial Ownership, Company Size, and Leverage on the Disclosure of Intellectual Capital. *Accounting Analysis Journal* 8(1):1-8.
- Birindelli, G., Ferretti, P., Chiappini, H. & Cosentino A. (2020). Intellectual Capital Disclosure: Some Evidence from Healthy and Distressed Banks in Italy. *Sustainability* 12:3174.
- Din, S.U., Arshad Khan, M., Khan, M.J. & Khan, M.Y. (2021). Ownership Structure and Corporate Financial Performance in An Emerging Market: A Dynamic Panel Data Analysis. *International Journal of Emerging Markets* ahead-of-print:ahead-of-print.
- Duff, A. (2018). Intellectual Capital Disclosure: Evidence From UK Accounting Firms. *Journal of Intellectual Capital* 19(4):768-786.
- Elvin, P. & Hamid, N.I.N.B.A. (2016). Ownership Structure, Corporate Governance, and Firm Performance. *International Journal Of Economics and Financial Issues* 6(3S).
- Goebel, V. (2019). Drivers for voluntary intellectual capital reporting based on agency theory. *Journal of Intellectual Capital* 20(2): 264-281.
- Hatane, S.E., Tarigan, J., Kuanda, E.S. & Cornelius, E. (2021a). The Contributing Factors of Intellectual Capital Disclosures in Agriculture and Mining Sectors of Indonesia and Thailand. *Accounting Research Journal* ahead-of-print:ahead-of-print.
- Hatane, S.E., Diandra, J.C., Tarigan, J. & Jie, P. (2021b). Voluntary Intellectual Capital Disclosure and Earnings Forecast in Indonesia-Malaysia-Thailand Growth Triangle's Pharmaceuticals Sector. *International Journal of Emerging Markets* ahead-of-print:ahead-of-print.
- Heryana, T., Wahyudi, S., & Mawardi, W. (2020). The Mediating Effect of Intellectual Capital Disclosure Between Firm Characteristics and Firm Value: Empirical Evidence From Indonesian Company With Non-recursive Model Analysis. *International Journal of Financial Research* 11(2):14.
- Indarti, M. G. K., Taswan, T., Bagana, B. D., & Janah, A. (2020). Corporate Governance Mechanism on Intellectual Capital Disclosure and Firm Value. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Banking, Accounting, Management and Economics (ICOBAME 2020)*.
- Iranmahd, M., Moeinaddin, M., Shahmoradi, N., & Heyrani, F. (2014). The Effect of Intellectual Capital on Cost of Finance and Firm Value. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance, and Management Sciences* 4(2):1-8.

- Jensen, M. C. & Meckling, W.H. (1976). Theory of The Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Cost and Ownership Structure. *Journal of Financial Economics* 3:305-360.
- Kamath, B. (2017). Determinants of Intellectual Capital Disclosure: Evidence From India. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting* 15(3):367-391.
- Liu, N., Laing, E., Cao, Y., & Zhang, X. (2018). Institutional Ownership and Corporate Transparency in China. *Finance Research Letters* 24(C):328-336.
- Machmuddah, Z., Sari, D. W., & Utomo, St. D. (2020). Corporate Social Responsibility, Profitability and Firm Value: Evidence from Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business* 7(9):631-638.
- Mamun, S.A.A. & Alkar, A. (2020). Intellectual Capital Disclosure Practices of Financial Institutions in an Emerging Economy. *PSU Research Review* 5(1):33-53.
- Mardini, G. H. & Labyani, F. E. (2020). Impact of Firm Performance and Corporate Governance Mechanisms on Intellectual Capital Disclosures in CEO Statements. *Journal of Intellectual Capital ahead-of-print:ahead-of-print*.
- McCracken, M., Melvor, R., Treacy, R. & Wall, T. (2018). A Study of Human Capital Reporting in the United Kingdom. *Accounting Forum* 42:130-141.
- Mukhibad, H. & Setyawati, M. E. (2019). Profitability Moderates Determinants of Intellectual Capital Disclosures. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi Dan Bisnis* 14(1):120-131.
- Mukti, A.H. & Istianingsih. (2018). The Impact of Ownership Structure on Intellectual Capital Disclosure. *International Business Management* 12(3):337-345.
- Muryanti, Y. D. & Subowo. (2017). The Effect Of Intellectual Capital Performance, Profitability, Leverage, Managerial Ownership, Institutional Ownership, And Independent Commissioner On The Disclosure Of Intellectual Capital. *Accounting Analysis Journal* 6(1):56-62.
- Musman, M., Muda, S., Hussain, A.H., & Arifin, N.N. (2018). Intellectual Capital Disclosure: The Function and Level of Disclosure. *International Journal of Accounting, Finance, and Business*, 2(6):147-154.
- Naimah, Z. & Mukti, N. A. (2019). The Influence of Audit Committee's and Company's Characteristics on Intellectual Capital Disclosure. *Asian Journal of Accounting Research* 4(2):170-180.
- Nurunnabi, M., Hossain, M., & Hossain. (2011). Intellectual Capital Reporting in a South Asian Country: Evidence From Bangladesh. *Journal of Human Resource Costing and Accounting* 15(3):196-233.
- Ognjanović, J. (2017). Relations of Intellectual Capital Components in Hotel Companies. *Industrija* 45(2).
- Oppong, G. K. & Pattanayak, J. K. (2019). Does Investing in Intellectual Capital Improve Productivity? Panel Evidence from Commercial Banks in India. *Borsa Istanbul Review* 19(3):219-227.
- Omeržel D.G. & Jurdana, D.S. (2016). The Influence of Intellectual Capital on Innovativeness and Growth in Tourism SMEs: Empirical Evidence from Slovenia and Croatia. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja* 29(1):1075-1090.
- Oxford Business Group. (2018). Indonesia's Tourism Sector Indicates Strong Expansion. Retrieved from <https://oxfordbusinessgroup.com/overview/island-attraction-legacy-destinations-and-new-offerings-indicate-strong-expansion>.
- Oxford Business Group. (2019). Thailand continues to attract growing numbers of visitors as it diversifies its tourism offering. Retrieved from <https://oxfordbusinessgroup.com/overview/tapping-new-sources-visitor-numbers-increase-officials-look-diversify-offering>.
- Ozkan, N., Cakan, B.S. & Kayacan, C.M. (2017). Intellectual Capital and Financial Performance: A Study of the Turkish Banking Sector. *Borsa Istanbul Review* 17 (3):190-198.
- Pasban, M., & Nojedeh, S. H. (2016). A Review of the Role of Human Capital in the Organization. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 230:249-253.
- Procházková, D. (2017). The Impact of Ownership and Other Corporate Characteristics on Performance of V4 Companies. *Journal of International Studies* 10(2):204-218.
- Putri, D. H. & Rokhmania, N. (2018). The Effect of Intellectual Capital Disclosure, Information Asymmetry, and Firm Size on Cost of Equity Capital with Managerial Ownership as a Moderating Variable. *The Indonesian Accounting Review* 8(2):163.
- Rahayuni, N., Solikhah, B., & Wahyudin, A. (2018). Mampukah Kinerja Keuangan Memediasi Pengaruh Mekanisme Corporate Governance Terhadap Pengungkapan Modal Intelektual?. *Jurnal Kajian Akuntansi* 2(1):67-81.
- Rahayu, D. P. (2019). The Effect of Intellectual Capital Disclosure, Corporate Governance, and Firm Size on Firm Value. *KnE Social Sciences*.

- Raimo, N., Ricciardelli, A., Rubino, M., & Vitolla, F. (2020). Factors Affecting Human Capital Disclosure in An Integrated Reporting Perspective. *Measuring Business Excellence* 24(4):575-592.
- Ramananda, D. & Nugrahanti, Y.W. (2014). Analisis Pengungkapan Intellectual Capital Berdasarkan Profitabilitas, Leverage, dan Size Perusahaan (Perbandingan antara Perusahaan Perbankan di Indonesia dan Thailand). *Dinamika Akuntansi, Keuangan dan Perbankan* 3(1):84-98
- Sakawa, H. & Watanabel, N. (2020). Institutional Ownership and Firm Performance under Stakeholder-Oriented Corporate Governance. *Sustainability* 12(3):1021.
- Simion, D. & Tobă, D. (2018). Impact Analysis of the Relationship: Intellectual Capital, Performance and Social Responsibility of the Organization. *Current Issues in Corporate Social Responsibility*:63-75.
- Susanto, Y.K., Pradipta, A., & Handoyo, I. (2019). Determinant of Intellectual Capital Disclosure. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law* 20(5).
- Ulfah, Y., Yudaruddin, R., & Azizil Yudaruddin, Y. (2021). Ownership Composition and Intellectual Capital Disclosure: Indonesia as a case study. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations* 18(2):37-47.
- Wee, J.C.N. & Chua, A.Y.K. (2016). The Communication of Intellectual Capital: The 'whys' and 'whats'. *Journal of Intellectual Capital* 17 (3):414-438.
- Widarjo, W., Rahmawati, B., & Widagdo, A. K. (2019). Underpricing and Intellectual Capital Disclosure: Evidence from Indonesia. *Global Business Review* 146575031985701.
- Widyastuti, A. & Aprillia, S. (2021). Intellectual Capital Disclosure (ICD): A Comparison between Indonesian and Chinese Universities. *Jurnal Akademi Akuntansi* 4(1).
- WorldBank. (2019). International Tourism Receipts. Retrieved from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/ST.INT.RCPT.CD>.
- Yan, X. (2017). Corporate Governance and Intellectual Capital Disclosures in CEOs' statements. *Nankai Business Review International* 8(1):2-21.

15%

SIMILARITY INDEX

8%

INTERNET SOURCES

11%

PUBLICATIONS

2%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

-
- | | | |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | Saarce Elsy Hatane, Felicia Nathania, Jocelyn Lamuel, Fenny Darusman, Devie. "Intellectual Capital Disclosures and Corporate Governance in Gaining the Firms' Non-Discretionary Profits and Market Value in ASEAN-5", Organizations and Markets in Emerging Economies, 2020
Publication | 1% |
| 2 | Saarce Elsy Hatane, Josua Tarigan, Elenne Stefanie Kuanda, Elizabeth Cornelius. "The contributing factors of intellectual capital disclosures in agriculture and mining sectors of Indonesia and Thailand", Accounting Research Journal, 2021
Publication | 1% |
| 3 | koreascience.or.kr
Internet Source | 1% |
| 4 | e-repository.unsyiah.ac.id
Internet Source | 1% |
| 5 | Saarce Elsy Hatane, Jefferson Clarenzo Diandra, Josua Tarigan, Ferry Jie. "Voluntary | 1% |
-

intellectual capital disclosure and earnings forecast in Indonesia–Malaysia–Thailand growth triangle's pharmaceuticals sector", International Journal of Emerging Markets, 2021

Publication

6

e-journal.uajy.ac.id

Internet Source

1 %

7

www.emerald.com

Internet Source

<1 %

8

Rani Aprilian, Kiagus Andi, Yunia Amelia. "THE EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY AND GOOD CORPORATE GOVERNANCE ON EARNINGS QUALITY", Jurnal Akuntansi dan Keuangan, 2020

Publication

<1 %

9

"Complex, Intelligent and Software Intensive Systems", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2021

Publication

<1 %

10

D. S. Pai, Latha Sridhar, Pulak Guhathakurta, H. R. Hatwar. "District-wide drought climatology of the southwest monsoon season over India based on standardized precipitation index (SPI)", Natural Hazards, 2011

Publication

<1 %

11 Journal of Human Resource Costing & Accounting, Volume 15, Issue 3 (2011-09-24) <1 %
Publication

12 Toni Heryana, Sugeng Wahyudi, Wisnu Mawardi. "The Mediating Effect of Intellectual Capital Disclosure Between Firm Characteristics and Firm Value: Empirical Evidence From Indonesian Company With Non-recursive Model Analysis", International Journal of Financial Research, 2020 <1 %
Publication

13 Hao Chen, Haobo Yan, Kai Gong, Xiao-Chen Yuan. "How will climate change affect the peak electricity load? Evidence from China", Journal of Cleaner Production, 2021 <1 %
Publication

14 Submitted to Lincoln University <1 %
Student Paper

15 Submitted to Assumption University <1 %
Student Paper

16 Mishari M. Alfraih. "The value relevance of intellectual capital disclosure: empirical evidence from Kuwait", Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance, 2017 <1 %
Publication

17 Submitted to Napier University <1 %
Student Paper

18

Elisabeth Albertini. "What are the environmental capabilities, as components of the sustainable intellectual capital, that matter to the CEOs of European companies?", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 2021

Publication

<1 %

19

Nicola Raimo, Alessandra Ricciardelli, Michele Rubino, Filippo Vitolla. "Factors affecting human capital disclosure in an integrated reporting perspective", *Measuring Business Excellence*, 2020

Publication

<1 %

20

link.springer.com

Internet Source

<1 %

21

www.scilit.net

Internet Source

<1 %

22

"Contemporary Issues in Sustainable Finance", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2021

Publication

<1 %

23

George William Lokko, Yang Li, Francis Atta Sarpong, Larsey Naphtali Akwetteh. "Management Share Proprietary and Firm Value: Are There Peculiar Determinants?", *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 2021

Publication

<1 %

24 Harishankar Vidyarthi, Ranjit Tiwari. "Cost, revenue, and profit efficiency characteristics, and intellectual capital in Indian Banks", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 2019

Publication

<1 %

25 *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Volume 13, Issue 4 (2012-10-13)

Publication

<1 %

26 garuda.ristekdikti.go.id

Internet Source

<1 %

27 www.koreascience.or.kr

Internet Source

<1 %

28 "The Dynamics of Intellectual Capital in Current Era", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2021

Publication

<1 %

29 I. Wayan Widnyana, I. Gusti Bagus Wiksuana, Luh Gede Sri Artini, Ida Bagus Panji Sedana. "Influence of financial architecture, intangible assets on financial performance and corporate value in the Indonesian capital market", *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 2020

Publication

<1 %

30 Randi Anto, Irene Rini Demi Pangestuti, Sugeng Wahyudi, Rezy Ayu Ramadhanti. "Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

<1 %

and Cost of Equity of ASEAN-5 Public Companies", Research in World Economy, 2021

Publication

31

Rohana Ngah, Abdul Razak Ibrahim. "The Influence of Intellectual Capital on Knowledge Sharing: Small and Medium Enterprises' Perspective", Communications of the IBIMA, 2011

Publication

<1 %

32

ajap.um.edu.my

Internet Source

<1 %

33

centaur.reading.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1 %

34

digitalcommons.odu.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

35

etheses.whiterose.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1 %

36

gemconsortium.org

Internet Source

<1 %

37

jab.fe.uns.ac.id

Internet Source

<1 %

38

jbees.or.kr

Internet Source

<1 %

39

oxfordbusinessgroup.com

Internet Source

<1 %

40	sro.sussex.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
41	worldwidescience.org Internet Source	<1 %
42	www.ssbfn.com Internet Source	<1 %
43	Mesut Doğan. "INST Institutional Ownership and Firm Value: A Study on the Bist Manufacturing Index", Ekonomika, 2020 Publication	<1 %
44	Mishari M. Alfraih. "Intellectual capital reporting and its relation to market and financial performance", International Journal of Ethics and Systems, 2018 Publication	<1 %
45	journal.wima.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 5 words

Exclude bibliography On