

Examination of the Relationship between Human Factor Disclosures and Market Value of Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria

Ekong A. Ambrose

Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

The need for increased disclosure of information in the financial statements has continued to generate interest from the stakeholders. Disclosure of information on human factors is a way of satisfying the yearnings of users. This study examines how market value of deposit money banks in Nigeria is influenced by human factor disclosure. The main objective of this study was to examine the relationship between human factor disclosures and the market value of deposit money banks in Nigeria. The data for the study were extracted from the financial statements of 14 money deposit banks listed on the floor of the Nigerian Stock Exchange for the years 2015 to 2018 using content analysis. The technique for data analysis employed in this study was the descriptive statistics and ordinary least square regression analysis. The result of the analysis showed an R-square value of 0.538 which implies that 53.8% of the variation in market value of deposit money banks in Nigeria is accounted for by human factor disclosures. The result of the analysis showed a beta coefficient of 0.737 for human factor disclosures. Based on the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that there is a significant relationship between human factor disclosures and market value of deposit money banks in Nigeria. The study therefore recommended amongst that the banks should strive to increase human factor disclosures in their financial statements in order to enhance their market values.

Keyword: Human factors; voluntary disclosures; market value; financial statements

INTRODUCTION

The demand for increased disclosure of information in the financial statement of companies have continued to attract global interest from stakeholders. This drive became exacerbated as a result of the collapse of global giants. Moreover, the complexities of business environment occasioned by advancement in technology has made users of financial statements to demand for more disclosures particularly non-financial information. This has made policy formulators, regulators and governments across jurisdictions to expand disclosure frontiers in recent times. For instance, the International Federation of Accountants (IFA) came up with a policy guidelines which highlighted some key areas in which preparers of financial statement need to focus on as a way of voluntary disclosures.

Financial reports provides information through which investors and other stakeholders make investment decisions. The decision of investors depends on the value placed on the firm as a result of financial information contained in the annual reports. According to [1] the most important role of annual reports is to provide relevant, useful and reliable financial information to investors, shareholders and other interested people about the financial position and performances of the business as well as its future prospects to help users in decision making. To serve this purpose, [2] opined that the information needs of the market and provide required information for corporate transparency and accountability, there is need to expand beyond traditional financial reporting model, that emphasises backward-

looking, quantified financial information.

Information disclosed in the annual reports are classified as mandatory and voluntary. It can also be classified as financial and non-financial. Mandatory disclosures are those that are disclosed in line with the provisions of the law; while voluntary are those that are freely made available in order to have more insights into the annual reports [3]. While voluntary disclosure is a free choice, there are various views on the items that should be disclosed. Among the areas identified is information pertaining to human factors should be disclosed as much as possible as a way of informing users of financial statements on the measures put in place to ensure continued sustenance of human resource which is considered as an important factor in the survival of such entity. Human factor represents all human elements and the activities that are put in place to enhance human performances in an organisation. Human resource as an intangible asset is the prime factor to ensure growth and smooth operation of organisation [4]. Corporate human capital has specifically been regarded as a valuable resource and a key factor for sustainable competitive advantage [5].

Disclosure of human factor information in the annual reports is value-relevant

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Conceptual Review

Concept of Human Factor and Disclosures

The terms human capital and human factors have been used interchangeably in literature. There is no universally accepted definition of human factor or human capital as some authors put it. Human factor is the generic term for the competences, skills, trainings and motivation of the employees. The human factor of the organisation comprises of all the qualities and professional skills the workers bring into the organisation. Human factor is owned by the worker and leaves along with him whenever he leaves the organisation. According to [6] human factor is a combination of factors possessed by individuals and the collective workforce of a firm which also encompass knowledge, skills

as this conveys the capacity of the organisations to sustain its performances into the foreseeable future. Thus investors in the banking sector are expected to be driven by this disclosure to make investment decisions in favour of the banks. Thus it is expected that the value of the banks will be enhanced and this will be experienced in the rise in the prices of shares of banks listed on the floor of the Nigerian stock exchange. The objective of every business is to maximize profit and increase the shareholders wealth. The shareholders wealth is increased whenever the share price increases in the stock market. The market value of an organization's shares is determined by a number of factors, some of which include inflation, interest rate, investor's behaviour and other macroeconomic variables as encapsulated in extant literature.

Upon a careful review of related literature, it was discovered that the nexus between human factor disclosures and the market value of deposit money banks in Nigeria has received very scanty attention. This therefore motivated this study which seeks to establish whether the disclosure of human factor disclosures on annual reports have any influence on the market value of deposit money banks in Nigeria.

and technical ability; personal traits such as intelligence, energy, attitude, reliability, commitment; ability to learn, including aptitude, imagination and creativity; desire to share information, participate in a team and focus on the goals of the organization.

Human factor is one of the important main components of intellectual capital, creating additional value in the economy based on knowledge and particularly in banks because the success depends on the employees with high level of competences, training and skills related to the work. That's why employees are becoming a valuable asset in the banks. [7] defines human factor as the practices related to education, training any other contributions that affect the performance of the company as the abilities, knowledge, values, skills of the

employee that would eventually end by increasing performance and employee's satisfaction.

[8] sees human factor as the most important intangible asset in the company which signifies skills, knowledge, intelligence, education, experience and the ability of employees to solve problems in the companies, and innovative ideas of the employees of the entire organization. [9] argued that all the expenses spend on developing the skills, knowledge, enhancing the education of the employees and the expertise as for example the payments for conferences and conventions, salaries and wages, fees and dues for training subscriptions should be considered as investments in intellectual capital.

Disclosure of Human Factors

There is no definitive concept of human factor disclosure. Thus far, there is also no established stand-alone human factor report that is systematically compiled by companies. Instead, human factor disclosure is only made voluntarily and it can be found interspersed throughout annual reports. As long as the information disclosed in annual reports pertains to human factor, it can be classified as human factor disclosure.

[10] carried out a study and found sectoral differences in reporting some of the human factor indicators. They

also found that the indicators were mainly collated internally, and a limited number were externally disclosed. Furthermore, majority of enterprises that they studied, irrespective of their business sector, kept their records of human factor indicators in the manual form.

[11] enumerated human factor disclosures to include information about: leadership; motivation; ability of execution of delegated tasks; relationship; number of employees; seniority in the company; stability in the company post; number of managers; number of women managers; percentage of managers with higher education; the average age of employees; the average length of training programs (hours/employee) and IT knowledge.

Human factor disclosures is usually in a list, which according to [12] is called a disclosure framework which is a predefined list of the possible disclosable items. [13] postulated that human factor disclosures are measured using disclosure index methodology which involves calculation of the number of information-related items that a given report contains, based on the disclosure framework. The human factor disclosure framework used by [14]; [15]; [16]; [17] are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: HR Disclosure indicator framework adopted by some prior studies

| Fontana and Macagnan (2013) | Huang et al (2008) | Micah et al (2012) | Al Mamun (2009) |
|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Number of employees | 1. Training | 1. Separate HRA statement | 1. Separate HRA statement |
| 2. Progression in the number of employees in recent years | 2. Human Resource development | 2. Total value of Human Resource (cost of HR maintenance) | 2. Total Value of Human resource |
| 3. Number of terminations | 3. Employee skill | 3. Number of Employees | 3. Number of employees |
| 4. New Hires | 4. Knowledge | 4. Human resource policy | 4. Human resource policy |
| 5. Absence or lack of staff | 5. Competence | 5. Training & development | 5. Training and development |
| 6. External rotation of staff | 6. Entrepreneurial spirit | 6. Management succession plan | 6. Management succession plan |
| 7. Internal rotation of staff | 7. Team work | 7. Employment report | 7. Employment report |
| 8. Employees scaled by seniority | 8. Human resources statistics | 8. Employee's value creation | 8. Employees' value addition |
| 9. Employees scaled by job description | 9. Expertise | 9. Human resource development fund | 9. Human resource development fund |
| 10. Employees scaled by age | 10. Leadership | 10. Employees/workers fund | 10. Employees/workers fund |
| 11. Employees scaled by education | 11. Strategic relationship | 11. Employee categories | 11. Employee categories |
| 12. Employees scaled by gender | 12. Education | 12. Managerial remuneration | 12. Managerial remuneration |
| 13. Employees by region | 13. Human Capital | 13. Retirement benefits | 13. Retirement benefits |
| 14. Description of training activities undertaken | 14. Knowledge management | 14. Performance Recognition | 14. Performance Recognition |
| 15. Training activities hours | 15. Intellectual Capital | 15. Pension fund | 15. Superannuation fund |
| 16. Training Expenses | 16. Vocation | 16. Other employees' benefits | 16. Other employees' benefits |
| 17. Employees with access to training | 17. Know how | | |
| 18. Hiring policy/recruitment | | | |
| 19. Pay policy and system | | | |
| 20. Career plan | | | |
| 21. Incentives program | | | |
| 22. Company benefits and social programs | | | |
| 23. Health and safety policy | | | |
| 24. Information on collective agreements | | | |
| 25. Measures of employee satisfaction | | | |

Source: Researcher's Compilation (2020).

Concept of Market Value of Shares

A share be described as an indivisible unit of capital, which expresses the relationship between the ownership of the company and the shareholder. The

owner of shares in the company is a shareholder (or stockholder) of the corporation. The denominated value of a share is its face value, and the total of the face value of issued shares

represent the capital of a company, which may not reflect the market value of those shares. Market price per share simply refers to the most recent price of a single share in a publicly-traded stock. This is not a fixed price; it fluctuates throughout the trading day as various market forces push the price in different directions. Unlike the book value per share, the market price per share has no

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Human Capital Theory

This theory was first propounded by [18] to explain the relationship between individual investments in education and training, and income differentials. This theory assumes that the individual is rational and methodical, seeks to maximize his lifetime earnings by making individual decisions to invest his resources in education. The theory also assumes a causal link between education, productivity and increases in earnings. Essentially, human capital theory assumes that the stock of human capital is directly correlated to productivity, that is, increase in the stock enhances productivity. The individual worker is compensated for increase in productivity. Since investments in education and training are direct avenues to increasing the stock of human capital, the individual will make investment to the present value of the increase in income stream they produce. Investments will be undertaken if the present value exceeds the associated costs and the rate of return is greater than that from other available alternatives.

Also, [19] [20] extended the human capital approach significantly when they incorporated the provision of training. Specifically, they introduced the fundamental distinction between the provision of general and specific training by the employer. General training refers to non-specific generic training that builds skills which are portable from one employer to another. This form of training is clearly desirable for the employee because it enhances his stock as well as his mobility. Employers need workers who have either received the desired general training from another employer, or will receive it from them. For the former, employers are willing to offer better

specific relation to the value of the company's assets or any other balance sheet information. Instead, the market price per share is influenced by supply and demand. Thus, the market value of a firm is the value of the issued share capital of the firm multiplied by the market price of the shares as at a given date.

employment terms to attract them. For the latter, however, the general training is financed by reduced earnings during the training and contractually obligated periods. Subsequently, the employer will need to offer improved terms to match other potential employers to retain the services of their trained employee. Employers can also offer general training as a recruitment tool. Specific training refers to specialized training that provides employees the skills which the employer requires for the firm's unique operation. Employers will provide this form of training to the extent that productivity is enhanced. Therefore, if the cost of education and training which are to increase productivity of the workers are taken as investment like the tangible assets which are reflected on the statement of financial position, it is also important to reflect the cost of investment in recruitment and selection, training and development on the statement of financial position as a capital item.

The assumption in this theory is that investment in education and training results in increased learning. Increased learning does, in fact, result in increased productivity. Greater productivity does, in fact, result in higher wages for individuals and earnings for businesses. This theory is relevant to this study because it emphasizes the relationship between investment in human factors through training and other welfare which will ultimately lead to improvement in the share prices of the firm. It is evident from the theory that a direct positive relationship exists between human factor disclosures and market values of firms.

Stakeholder Theory

The stakeholder theory was postulated by Freeman in 1984. [21] defined

stakeholder to mean “any group of people or individual who can affect or be affected by the strides of an organization’s goal. [22] defined a stakeholder as any entity (outside the firm) that the organization targets to influence and whose impact the organization will also feel. In other words, stakeholders are a group of people that have massive influence on the organization’s business success. [23] configured a stakeholder’s managerial theory model to include; Government, Competitors, Employees, Suppliers, Customers, and the civil society. The model was a complete exit from the traditional stakeholder analysis from shareholders’ perspective. According to [24], there are two basic classifications of stakeholders- which is the primary and the secondary. The primary stakeholders are the indispensable ones.

EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Several studies have been conducted on the disclosure of human factor information. For instance, [26] investigated the level of human resources disclosures by the commercial banks in their annual reports focusing on a developing country, Malawi. Examination was done using content analysis and a human resources disclosure index (HRDI) was employed to measure the disclosure levels. The results gave an average disclosure value of (0.2) indicating that less than a quarter of the disclosure items were disclosed by the sampled commercial banks which is relatively a low level of HR disclosure. Furthermore “separate HR statement” and “statement of policy on training and development” were the disclosure items that scored the highest (0.8). In addition, the study revealed that about 46% of the disclosable items were not disclosed by any of the sampled banks. The disclosures were also found to be largely narrative and were mainly disclosed in chairman’s and chief executive officer’s reports.

[27] explored the voluntary Human Capital (HC) disclosures determinants in the annual reports of the Lebanese commercial banks. 48 annual reports were examined in the study, representing a sample of 16 commercial Lebanese banks in the period of 2015-2017. The statistical and the regression

They comprise of shareholders, employees, customers, and suppliers. The secondary stakeholders are those whose actions can affect the firm or be affected by it; they are also important. They are communities, government, activists, and non-governmental institutions [25]. This stakeholder analysis focuses on the desire and needs of all the parties involved.

This theory is relevant to this work because, stakeholders deserve to be provided with any information that will enable them have insight into the activities of the firm. This will enable them take any decision with regards to the firm. Human factor disclosure is considered as one of such information requirements which will enhance the decision making process of stakeholders.

results showed that size, age and foreign ownership, explain the level of voluntary HC disclosures. In contrast, leverage and profitability were not considered as determinants of HC disclosure in the Lebanese commercial banks.

[28] investigated the intellectual capital disclosure of Italian banks over the years 2016-2017 and found that intellectual capital (IC) disclosure is generally poor and that the intensity of disclosure varies slightly between healthy and distressed banks. They argued that regarding the quality of disclosure, healthy banks present a higher, albeit modest, tendency to disclose non-qualitative and forward-looking information, maybe due to the fact that they are more focused on the strategies and the relationships with stakeholders as opposed to a more short-term approach of the distressed banks. To complement their study on healthy and distressed banks,

The researchers repeated the analysis focusing on bank size and independent directors. In this case, results did not show relevant differences in terms of IC disclosure. Hence, their findings suggested the need to consider banks’ IC disclosure as a strategic asset for increasing, among others, transparency and reputation.

[29] examined the possible determinants of human capital disclosure among listed firms in Nigeria. Their findings indicated a significant positive influence on firm's age, size and industry classification on human capital disclosure. [30] provided empirical evidences on the corporate social disclosure practice in the highly regulated industries namely banking and finance. Result from the study on disclosure theme shows that product related disclosure was highest. [5] extended the literature on voluntary disclosure by investigating the impact of precision attribute of social and human capital disclosure on information asymmetry. They provided evidence on how the stock market reacts to different levels of information precision. Overall, results suggested that quantitative disclosure reduces share price volatility and increases Tobin's Q.

[8] identified the effect of the disclosure of intellectual capital on the market value of shares in Jordanian commercial banks by shedding light on the level of

Ekong
disclosure of intellectual, human, structural and relational capital on the market value of the share. The study community composed of all the Jordanian industrial companies and public shares traded in the Amman Stock Exchange during the study period (2013–2016). The researcher reached the most important results which showed that the general trend in the 4 years (2013–2016) was towards increasing the level of disclosure of the components of intellectual capital. This indicated the continuous increase by the industrial companies at the level of disclosure, However, this level was below the required threshold, not exceeding in all years (56.0%). There is also a relative increase in the level of disclosure of structural capital and interest relative to the disclosure of human capital, which may be seen as a decline in the interest of companies in the development of their human resources compared to the structural aspect and relations with other parties.

METHODOLOGY

Hypothesis Development

In order to carry the study, the following hypotheses were formulated.

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between human factor disclosures and market value of Deposit money banks in Nigeria.

This hypothesis was postulated in order to test whether disclosure of human factor has any effect on the market value of money deposit banks in Nigeria.

H₀₂: There is no significant influence of human factor disclosures on the share price of Deposit money banks in Nigeria.

This hypothesis is postulated to give support to the earlier hypothesis (1)

above. This is in view of the fact that market share price and market value can be measured differently though sometimes they are considered to be the same.

This study adopted ex-post facto design. The population of the study consisted of fourteen (14) listed deposit money banks in Nigeria. The data were extracted from the annual reports of the banks for the period under review using content analysis method.

The definitions of the dependent and independent variables and their expected signs are as given on the Table 2.

Table 2: Dependent and Independent Variables

| S/N | Variables | Types | Measurement | Apiori Expectation |
|-----|--------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------|
| 1. | Market Value | Dependent | Market Capitalization of shares | |
| 2. | Human factor Disclosures | Independent | "1" for Disclosure and "0" for non-disclosure | Positive |

Source: Researcher's Computation (2020).

Based on prior studies the proxies for human factor disclosure were constructed to include the followings:a)

Staff Training and Development (STD);
b) Employment of Disable Persons (EDP);
c) Number of Employees (NE); d)

Employee Turnover (ET); e) Medical Benefits (MB); f) Health and Safety Policies (H&SP); g) Staff development (SD); h) and i) Retirement Benefits (RB). They were measured using dummy variable 0 and 1 where 0 represented non-disclosure and 1 represented disclosure.

Thus the first model can be developed as:

$$HFD = F(STD + EDP + NE + ET + MB + H\&SP + SD + RB) \dots \dots \dots \text{Equation 1}$$

Where HFD = Human Factor Disclosure; and other variables are as explained above.

The models adopted for this study are:

$$MV = \beta_0 + B_1 HFD_i, t + \varepsilon \dots \dots \dots \text{Equation 2}$$

Where:

MV = Market Value, HFD = Human Factor Disclosures, ε = Stochastic Error term, β_0 = Constant, B_1 = Coefficient of variables $i, t = \text{bank } i \text{ in year } t$.

The technique for data analysis employed in this study was the descriptive statistics and ordinary least square regression analysis. The researcher took cognizance of ethical issues by acknowledging all cited works in the reference list. The researcher also maintained data integrity by ensuring that the data obtained from the annual reports were reported the way it was captured.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics

| | MARKET_VALUE (₦) | HUMAN FACTOR DISCLOSURE |
|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Mean | 237,452,743,545.052 | 8.615385 |
| Maximum | 1,199,320,553,378.0 | 11.00000 |
| Minimum | 2,432,892,000.0 | 6.000000 |
| Std. Dev. | 259,337,281,400.0387 | 1.339728 |
| Skewness | 1.473805 | -0.053116 |
| Kurtosis | 4.873436 | 2.385467 |
| Jarque-Bera | 46.25140 | 1.474718 |
| Probability | 0.000000 | 0.478376 |
| Sum | 21,608,199,662,599.7 | 784.0000 |
| Sum Sq. Dev. | 6.05E+24 | 161.5385 |
| Observations | 91 | 91 |

Source: Researcher's Computation using E-views (2020)

The distribution tilted towards the right tail of the normal curve as the skewness value stood at 1.473. The distribution of the data set for market value was leptokurtic as the kurtosis value was 4.873. The Jarque-Bera statistic of 46.25 and p-value of 0.0000 implies that the null hypothesis of the study will be rejected and the alternate accepted. The distribution tilted towards the left tail of the normal curve as the skewness value

stood at -0.0531. The distribution of the data set for human factor disclosure was platykurtic as the kurtosis value was 2.385 which is less than 3 required for a normal curve. The Jarque-Bera statistic of 1.4747 and p-value of 0.4783 implies that the null hypothesis of the study will be accepted and the alternate rejected.

Unit Root and Co-integration Test

Table 4: Unit Root test Result

| | | | |
|---|-----------|--------------------|---------------|
| Null Hypothesis: MARKET_VALUE has a unit root | | | |
| Exogenous: Constant | | | |
| Lag Length: 0 (Automatic - based on SIC, maxlag=11) | | | |
| | | | |
| | | t-Statistic | Prob.* |
| Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic | | -3.353638 | 0.0153 |
| Test critical values: | 1% level | -3.504727 | |
| | 5% level | -2.893956 | |
| | 10% level | -2.584126 | |
| | | | |
| *MacKinnon (1996) one-sided p-values. | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|--------------------|---------------|
| Null Hypothesis: TOTAL_DISCLOSURE has a unit root | | | |
| Exogenous: Constant | | | |
| Lag Length: 0 (Automatic - based on SIC, maxlag=11) | | | |
| | | | |
| | | t-Statistic | Prob.* |
| Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic | | -1.745524 | 0.4051 |
| Test critical values: | 1% level | -3.504727 | |
| | 5% level | -2.893956 | |
| | 10% level | -2.584126 | |
| | | | |
| *MacKinnon (1996) one-sided p-values. | | | |

Source: Researcher's Computation using E-views (2020)

From the results in Table 4 above, it is evident that market value did not possessed unit root when common unit root is assumed as indicated by the ADF test statistic at 5% confidence interval but human factor disclosures had. This is because the probability figure

obtained for the variables are below 5% significant benchmark and as such the null hypotheses proposing that there is unit root in each case were rejected for market value and accepted for human factor disclosures.

Co-integration Test

Table 5- Co-integration Test Result

| | | | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|------------------|--------|
| Date: 07/07/20 Time: 11:19 | | | | |
| Series: MARKET_VALUE TOTAL_DISCLOSURE | | | | |
| Sample: 1 91 | | | | |
| Included observations: 91 | | | | |
| Null hypothesis: Series are not cointegrated | | | | |
| Cointegrating equation deterministics: C | | | | |
| Automatic lags specification based on Schwarz criterion (maxlag=11) | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Dependent | tau-statistic | Prob.* | z-statistic | Prob.* |
| MARKET_VALUE | -3.377109 | 0.0534 | -20.62599 | 0.0365 |
| TOTAL_DISCLOSURE | -1.771824 | 0.6452 | -7.411309 | 0.5258 |
| *MacKinnon (1996) p-values. | | | | |
| Intermediate Results: | | | | |
| | | MARKET_VALUE | TOTAL_DISCLOSURE | |
| Rho - 1 | | -0.229178 | -0.082348 | |
| Rho S.E. | | 0.067862 | 0.046476 | |
| Residual variance | | 2.74E+22 | 0.328483 | |
| Long-run residual variance | | 2.74E+22 | 0.328483 | |
| Number of lags | | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of observations | | 90 | 90 | |
| Number of stochastic trends** | | 2 | 2 | |
| **Number of stochastic trends in asymptotic distribution | | | | |

Source: Researcher's Computation using E-views (2020)

The hypothesis of no cointegration is accepted because the p-values of both the T-statistics and z-statistic of all the variables are all greater than 0.05. This implies that the variables are not cointegrated. This shows that there is no long run relationship among the variables.

The research hypothesis was tested in this section of the study. The test was carried out using Ordinary least square regression with the model specification shown below using SPSS software. The result of the analysis is shown in Table 6. The model specification is shown thus;

$$\text{LogLMV} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogHFD}_{i,j} + \mu$$

Table 6: Model Summary^b

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .737 ^a | .543 | .538 | .4596306 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), LOGHFD
 b. Dependent Variable: LOGMV

Table 7: ANOVA^a

| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 22.361 | 1 | 22.361 | 105.845 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 18.802 | 89 | .211 | | |
| | Total | 41.163 | 90 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: LOGMV
 b. Predictors: (Constant), LOGHFD

Table 8: Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|---------|------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 10.563 | .065 | | 162.149 | .000 |
| | LOGHFD | .045 | .004 | .737 | 10.288 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: LOGMV

The null hypothesis one states that there is no significant influence of human factor disclosures on market value of Deposit money banks in Nigeria. Based on the decision rule of the study, the null hypothesis one of the study is rejected and the alternate

accepted because the p-value of 0.000 shown in Table 7 is greater than 0.05. The null hypothesis is further rejected because the F-cal value of 105.845 is greater than the critical value of F which was 3.948.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The result of the analysis showed an R-square value of 0.538 which implies that 53.8% of the variation in market value of deposit money banks in Nigeria is accounted for by human factor disclosures. The result of the analysis showed a beta coefficient of 0.737 for human factor disclosures. This implies that 73.7% of the increase in market value of deposit money banks in Nigeria is caused by human factor disclosures. This result means that more human factor disclosures will increase the market value of deposit money banks in Nigeria. This finding is supported by the fact that human factors are considered

as labour and there is a positive relationship between labour and profitability and market value has a relationship with profitability. Thus an increase in human factor disclosures will cause an increase in market value of the companies. This finding is in line with findings of Ali (2018) who identified the effect of the disclosure of intellectual capital on the market value of shares in Jordanian commercial banks by shedding light on the level of disclosure of intellectual, human, structural and relational capital on the market value of the share.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that there is a significant influence of human factor disclosures on market value of deposit

money banks in Nigeria. The findings revealed that human factor disclosure positively impacts the market value of the deposit money banks in Nigeria.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were made:

statements as these would lead to increase in their market value.

1. The banks should strive to increase their human factor disclosures in the financial

2. The management of banks should endeavour to embark on schemes and activities which directly impact on the welfare of workers as this will motivate

- them to disclose more information on human factors.
3. The government should encourage banks to disclose more information on human

Ekong factors in their financial statement either by way of persuasion or establish minimum disclosure on human factors.

REFERENCES

1. Abeysekera, I., & Guthrie, J. (2004). Human capital reporting in a developing nation. *The British Accounting Review*, 36(3): 251-268.
2. Ahuja, L. M. (2014). *Modern Economics*. New Delhi, PVT Publishing Ltd.
3. Al Mamun, S. A. (2009). Human resource accounting (HRA) disclosure of Bangladeshi companies and its association with corporate characteristics. *BRAC University Journal 1 (1): 35-43*.
4. Ali, O.A. (2018). The effect of disclosure of intellectual capital components on the market price of shares in Jordanian industrial companies: An empirical study. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 8(5):156-167.
5. Beattie, V. McInnes, W. and Fearnley, S. (2004). A Methodology for Analysing and Evaluating Narratives in Annual Reports: A Comprehensive Descriptive Profile Metrics for Disclosure Quality Attributes, *Accounting Forum*, 28(3), 205 - 236.
6. Becker, G. S., (1964). *Human capital*. New York: McGraw Hill.
7. Binh, T. Q. (2012). Voluntary Disclosure Information in Annual Reports of Non-Financial Listed Companies: The case of Vietnam, *Journal of Applied Economics and Business Research*, 2 (3), 69-90
8. Birindelli, G., Ferrentti, P. Chiappini, H. & Cosentino, A. (2020). Intellectual capital disclosure: Some evidence from healthy and distressed banks in Italy. *Sustainability*, 12(3174): 1-20.
9. Bukh, P. N., Nielsen, C., Gormsen, P. & Mouritsen, J. (2005). Disclosure of information on intellectual capital in Danish IPO prospectuses. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 18 (6): 713-732.
10. Comier, D., Aerts, W. Ledoux, M., & Magnan, M. (2009). Attributes of social and human capital disclosure and information Asymmetry between managers and investors. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 26(1): 71-88.
11. Echekeba, F., Egbunike, C. & Ezu, G. (2011). Determinants of bank profitability in Nigeria: Using CAMEL rating model (2001-2010). *International Business Res.*, 2 (4): 176 - 183.
12. Effiong, S., Inyang, W., Ejabu, F., Bogbo, R. & Atu, O. (2017). Equity market timing and earnings yield: Evidence from quoted manufacturing companies in Nigeria. *International Journal of Accounting Intelligence* 1(4): 29-40.
13. Fontana, F. B. & Macagnan, C. B. (2013). Factors explaining the level of voluntary human capital disclosure in the Brazilian capital market. *Intangible Capital*, 9(1): 305-321.
14. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. London. Financial Times Prentice Hall.
15. Gharoie, A. R. (2011). The relationship between intellectual capital and financial performance: An empirical investigation in an Iranian company. *Academic Journal*, 5(1):88-95.
16. Hamid, F. Z. (2004). *Corporate social disclosure by banks and finance companies*. Malaysian
17. Hay, D.A. (2018). The determinants of human capital voluntary disclosures in the Lebanese commercial banks. *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal*, 22(6):1-18.

18. Huang, C. C., Abidin, Z. Z.&Jusoff, K. (2008). External reporting of human capital in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*, 4(8):3-11.
19. Ionel, V. C., Alina, C.&Dumitru, M.I.(2010). Human resources accounting - accounting for the most valuable asset of an enterprise. *The Journal of the Faculty of Economics - Economic*, 1(2): 925-931.
20. Lipunga, A. M. (2013). Human resources disclosure by commercial banks: A case study of Malawi. *International Journal of Applied Research in Business Administration and Economics*, 2(5):3-17.
21. Micah, L. C., Ofurum C.O.&Ihendinihu, J. U. (2012). Firms financial performance and human Resource Accounting Disclosure in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management* 7(14):140-150.
22. Mincer, J. (1958), Investment in human capital and personal income distribution. *Journal of Political Economy*, 66(1): 275-281
23. Murray, K, &Vogel, C. (1997). Using a hierarchy-of-effects approach to gauge the effectiveness of corporate social responsibility to generate goodwill toward the Firm: Financial versus non-financial impacts. *Journal of Business Research*, 38(2): 141-159.
24. Mutalib, A., Hafiz, M. &Hairul, A. (2017). Determinant of human capital disclosure in the post IFRS regime: an examination of listed firms in Nigeria. *Malaysian Accounting Review*, 16 (2):1-20.
25. Nnama, O.J. (2005). Financial sector development and economic growth in Nigeria. *Economic and Review*, 42(3): 230-245.
26. Perera, A.&Thrikawala, S. (2012). Impact of human capital investment on firm financial performances: An empirical study of companies in Sri Lanka. *International Proceedings of Economics Development & Research*. 54(2):11-16.
27. Rizvi, S. (2010). Development and preliminary validation of a new measure to assess shame: The shame inventory. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*. 32(1): 438-447.
28. Schultz, T. W. (1963). *The economic values of education*. New York: Columbia University Press
29. Waddock, S.A., & Graves, S.B. (1997). The corporate social performance-financial performance link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18:303-319.
30. Wickramasinghe V. &Fonseka N. (2012). Human resource measurement and reporting in manufacturing and service sectors in Sri Lanka. *Journal of Human Resource Costing & Accounting* 16 (3): 235-252.